

February 21, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

Dr. Brady's 50th Year of Medical Practice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, Dr. John C. Brady of Buffalo, N.Y., last week celebrated his 50th year of medical practice.

Chief surgeon at Sisters Hospital in Buffalo for 25 years as well as an assistant professor at State University at Buffalo, Dr. Brady is a devout Knight of St. Gregory and an ardent golfer.

I call Dr. Brady's anniversary to the attention of my colleagues because I think we all are aware of the great need for devoted and dedicated doctors like Dr. Brady.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an article from the Buffalo Courier-Express relating Dr. Brady's life and outstanding career:

KNIGHT KEEPS OATH: DEDICATION TO RELIGION AND HEALING MARKS SURGEON

(By Jim McAvay)

Daily Mass: In 1916, when he was 25, Dr. John C. Brady made a solemn pledge.

"I will preserve the purity of my life and my art," he said, as he took the Hippocratic oath.

Today, at 75, Dr. Brady goes to mass in a Roman Catholic Church at 8 every morning. He usually gets to bed between 11:30 p.m. and midnight but he makes Mass regardless of how many hours' sleep he gets.

Busy practice: On the average, he performs four operations a week in Sisters Hospital. He has a very busy, full-time practice at his office-home, 240 Morris Avenue, with office hours Monday afternoon and evening and Wednesday and Friday afternoons.

Dr. Brady is an ardent golfer who shoots in the eighties and delights in giving the younger set their comeuppance on the links. The only remote concession he makes to the possibility that the years may be taking some toll is when he says, "I used to be able to get down in the seventies toward the end of the season."

Golfing injury: He was a topnotch football player at Canisius High and College and Fordham University. The doctor now walks with a limp from an injury he suffered on a golf course 6 years ago. He was riding in a cart when it was hit by another cart. He was dumped hard on the ground.

"I came down on one leg and twisted my hip and I've had a lot of pain from it since," he said.

He is a spry, rugged looking 75. He has all but two of his own teeth; his hearing and eyesight are fine and his 5-foot-9-inch, 160-pound frame is solid looking. He has a full head of gray hair and a ruddy complexion.

Ches smoke perit. Dr. Brady has been a pipe and cigar smoker for more than 50 years but believes there is definitely a connection between chain smoking and cancer.

He was born in Buffalo and he and his wife, the former Leila McGuire, had a son and four daughters. One daughter died several years ago.

Dr. Brady received his medical degree from Fordham University and completed his training at Bellevue and Allied Hospitals. During World War I, he served in an Army medical unit in France.

Chief surgeon: He was chief surgeon at Sisters Hospital for 25 years and during World War II was director of surgery at Meyer Memorial Hospital. He retired as chief consultant at Meyer Memorial 10 years ago at the same time he retired as an assistant professor at the State University at Buffalo.

Dr. Brady said it is impossible for him to estimate how many thousands of people he has treated over the years and how many thousands of operations he has performed.

"I would just have to say thousands," he said. "But there has been a tremendous change in medicine since I started practice. In the old days if you couldn't perform an operation in a hour, it was no good. Now an operation may last 9 hours or more."

Notes advances: We had lots of real trouble with typhoid, measles, and scarlet fever," Dr. Brady said. "That's just about gone now. And too, 40 to 80 percent of the cases in which an appendix ruptured were fatal. You almost never hear of that anymore. Brain surgery wasn't much in the early days and chest and heart surgery have just come into their own in recent years."

In 1942, the Pope made Dr. Brady a Knight of St. Gregory. The doctor accepted that not only as a great honor but also as a great obligation and it was then that he began his practice of attending Mass every day.

On Monday, Dr. Brady was honored at the 160th annual convention of the State Medical Society in New York City for completing 50 years of medical practice. He was given a certificate citing his dedication to his community and his profession.

Implied, of course, was recognition of the fact that he preserved "the purity of his life and his art."

Ashburnham Bicentennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, February 22 has a special significance for the town of Ashburnham, Mass., in my district. Not only does the day mark the birthday of George Washington—a day when the people of this great Nation pay homage to the memory of the man who most fully personifies our most cherished traditions of strength, wisdom, and independence—but it also marks the day of the founding of this thriving community, which I have the honor and privilege of representing in this House.

And with the coming of February 22 this year, there will have come to an end in Ashburnham a year that will long be remembered by the town as the year of celebration marking the 200th anniversary of this proud, outstanding community.

It is a year ago this month, Mr. Speaker, that the Ashburnham Historical Society opened Ashburnham's year-long bicentennial with a silver tea in the Ashburnham Community Church with members and guests dressed in colonial costumes. Later on in April, the gala bicentennial ball was held in the Oakmont Regional School cafeteria. The highlight of the anniversary celebration came in October with a huge

parade, one of the finest ever held in northern Worcester County, which attracted over 30,000 people and several thousand marchers.

There were more than 100 units from Massachusetts and New Hampshire which thrilled the crowds along the 3-mile parade route through the center of the town. It was particularly pleasing for me to arrange for the participation of Federal units in the parade at the request of my friend, W. Irving Taylor, chairman of the bicentennial parade committee, and I am happy to report to my colleagues in the House that the various branches of the service were well represented in the parade.

With the opening of Ashburnham's bicentennial, I was happy and proud to send a special message of greeting to the Ashburnham community and under unanimous consent the text of my letter will be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1965.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN,
Ashburnham, Mass.

MY DEAR FRIENDS: I have been informed that you will celebrate the 200th anniversary of the incorporation of Ashburnham on February 22, and I am very proud and pleased indeed, to send you and the loyal patriotic people of your outstanding community, my heartiest congratulations upon this great event and all best wishes for the future.

Your great own of Ashburnham is rich in history, strong in patriotism and loyalty to the Nation, vigorous in its progress and advancement. For the magnificent contributions of your people throughout the years since the early origins of our Government, I express my deep gratitude; for your magnificent achievements, my unbounded admiration; for your inspiring loyalty to the Nation, my pride and appreciation for your noble, forward-looking public spirit and your high purpose for the future, my prayers, my pledge of wholehearted cooperation, and my complete confidence in your ability to reach your high goals.

This day will go down in the history of our State and our country. It is another proud marker of your progress, your vitality, and your determination to go forward.

Warm regards and best wishes to all.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

In these troubled times, Mr. Speaker, it is well to recall, as we pay homage to the memory of George Washington, that the early settlers of Ashburnham were of the same intrepid breed of pioneers which helped to build this great land. Like George Washington, they chose liberty as their standard and rejected tyranny at all costs.

It was on February 22, 1765—that same year that George Washington was supporting Patrick Henry's revolutionary Stamp Act in the Virginia House of Burgesses—that the little settlement of Dorchester Canada in the rocky wilderness came into existence as the incorporated town of Ashburnham.

Located in the easternmost part of Worcester County on the New Hampshire line, Ashburnham was established from seven early land grants, notably the Dorchester Canada or Township grant of 1735, which was divided among the de-

railroads, over six times as much as in fiscal 1965.

On the State level, the heavy involvement of State agencies in commuter travel is a fairly recent development. Pennsylvania's SEPTA grew out of the first payment by Philadelphia of a \$160,000 subsidy to Reading Co. and the Pennsy in 1958. In the coming 18 months, SEPTA will spend \$8 million in various forms of transportation aid.

Another agency with a swelling commitment to support commuter railroads is the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority, which last year started paying the \$4 million net cost of sustaining commuter service by the New Haven and the Boston & Maine Railroad. The authority also is seeking \$27.3 million in Federal funds as part of a \$41 million project to restore long-abandoned rail service on the Old Colony Line, purchased from the New Haven last November.

Even the New York Central—one of the few eastern roads that hasn't asked for operating subsidies—is looking for governmental support. The company is seeking \$57.7 million in State and Federal assistance for long-term rehabilitation of its commuter facilities. The Central currently is spending \$1.6 million of its own money to refurbish 40 coaches. But it claims commuter service doesn't earn a return on such investment, and looks to governments for future major outlays.

UNITED STATES APPOINTS OVERALL AID COORDINATOR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as stated in my report to the Senate on my trip to Vietnam, I have been convinced of one overriding and vital necessity in our policy there; namely, the need for an overall head to supervise the variety of nonmilitary programs we are carrying out in that country.

While in Vietnam, I was struck by the fact that not only was our economic and social aid inadequate but that there was also no overall direction and coordination in nonmilitary efforts. The problems of pacification, care of refugees, and improvement of the health, education, and welfare of the Vietnamese people were handled by diverse agencies.

I am pleased today to see that the President of the United States has moved to rectify the situation by the appointment of a deputy U.S. envoy "to take full charge" of nonmilitary aspects of the struggle in Vietnam. This important job has been given to Deputy Ambassador William Porter who, I hope, will be given powers commensurate with his responsibilities.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article written by Ward Just which was published in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPUTY U.S. ENVOY TO ASSIST SAIGON IN RURAL PACIFICATION
(By Ward Just)

SAIGON, February 17.—Deputy Ambassador William Porter was named today to take full charge of the proliferating nonmilitary aspects of the U.S. effort in the war in Vietnam.

In a statement released today, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge said that Porter, 51, would handle all aspects of the work of the United

States in support of the Vietnamese Government's program of rural construction as defined at the Honolulu conference.

The Lodge statement said that "this includes helping the Government of Vietnam in its task of overcoming by police methods the criminal, as distinct from the military, aspect of Vietcong violence, and the training and installation of health, education, and agricultural workers and of community organizers."

In the past, critics have contended that the American effort here has been complicated and made more difficult by what has seemed to be an overabundance of agencies, some of which appear to have overlapping functions.

On paper, the appointment makes Porter the boss of what has come to be known here as the pacification program, and reflects the Johnson administration's strong effort to make the struggle in Vietnam a "two-front" war.

Officials emphasized, however, that although Porter will have a small staff and will be released from the routine duties of Deputy Ambassador (he will retain the title), the new job has as yet "no bones."

What is expected is that Porter will become a chief of staff, coordinating the pacification effort. This has tended to become entangled over the years with a number of agencies taking a hand in funding, programming and directing the various economic, political, social, and psychological warfare efforts. Porter's job, a U.S. mission spokesman said, "is to pull the effort together."

Officials said that Porter will work closely with Maj. Gen. Nguyen Duc Thang, Minister of Rural Construction, and the key Vietnamese official in the pacification effort.

The Lodge statement emphasized that Maj. Gen. Edward Lansdale, an influential proponent of pacification, would continue as senior liaison officer and adviser to the Vietnamese Government.

"We are determined that this program for peace and progress shall be carried forward with all the energy and skill of a fully coordinated mission effort, always with full recognition that the basic task of nation building here belongs to the people of Vietnam and to their Government," the Lodge statement said.

Porter, who replaced U. Alexis Johnson as Deputy Ambassador here last September, is a former Ambassador to Algeria.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Timothy J. May, of Colorado, to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department; and Robert L. Sumwalt, of South Carolina, and Victor Bussie, of Louisiana, to be members of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nathan M. Koffsky, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. METCALF, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

A FIRSTHAND REPORT ON VIETNAM

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, we always welcome the comments and views of our men in Vietnam. One of my young constituents from Livingston, Mont., has just returned after a tour of duty as a seaman construction mechanic with Mobile Construction Battalion 9 of the Seabees.

While home on leave, the publisher of the Park County News, Mr. Fred Martin, interviewed the young man, Thad Gibson. In providing me with a copy of that interview, Mr. Martin described Thad as "having the typical American spirit, the kind which is making friends for us all over the world."

I was impressed with Thad's ideas and his views. He demonstrates remarkable insight in what we all realize is a very complex problem. He believes the average friendliness of our men in Vietnam will be the determining factor as to whether or not the sacrifice we are making in lives and billions of dollars will be worthwhile.

In his own words:

The war will be won by average Americans, who have the same feeling for a suffering Vietnamese old person or youngster that they would have right here in America.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert the article in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Park County News, Feb. 10, 1966]

THAD GIBSON'S FIRSTHAND REPORT ON VIETNAM

The average friendliness of the American Joe in Vietnam will be the determining factor as to whether or not the sacrifice of lives

and the expenditure of billions of dollars will be fruitful, Thad Gibson, seaman construction mechanic with Mobile Construction Battalion 9 of the Seabees, declares.

Thad, just back from the Vietnam conflict, is spending a short leave in Livingston with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. William G. Gibson, 131 South Yellowstone. He will report for duty at Port Hueneme, Calif., where he will be assigned for from 6 to 9 months before another Vietnam assignment. Thad, who has been in the Seabees for 2 years, completed his high school course, after enlisting by taking special courses at Oxnard City High, California, and while at Port Hueneme plans to enroll in Ventura College, Ventura, Calif., to take mechanical or architectural courses, which he hopes to continue by correspondence in Vietnam and after completing his service requirements.

Thad has been under fire and recently was quoted in an Associated Press dispatch (reported in Park County News January 27) which told of the death of a Marine pal and the serious wounding of another Seabee friend at Da Nang East, Vietnam. Thad considers himself mighty lucky to be back, but he has no qualms about returning to Vietnam.

"Those of us who are in the service and assigned there figure we have a job to do, want to do it and get it over with. We can understand how some people in the States who do not know what it's all about get so confused. After coming home it is easy to realize how folks here, who can't imagine what we go through, fail to understand what this Vietnam conflict is all about.

"In the first place, the French were in Vietnam for more than 40 years. They were out to exploit the country, get what they could out of it, and the Vietnamese are just now beginning to realize, after 12 years, that the Americans are there to help them, not to squeeze profits out of them.

"The war will be won by average Americans, who have the same feeling for a suffering Vietnamese old person or a youngster that they would right here in America. It is hard for us to understand how elder people are the dominant ruling class in Vietnam. The Vietcong hold the elders as hostages, kill them or threaten them. But, gradually the elders and the ordinary Vietnamese are finding that the Americans are sincerely charitable, helpful, and friendly.

"It is not unusual for an American serviceman to buy clothing and shoes for youngsters. Our Seabee outfit, through a pay deduction plan, finances the operation of an orphanage for 1,500 children, all orphaned by the conflict. The orphanage is operated by Catholic nuns.

"We hear stories of political manipulation, struggles for power to control the native government and graft, but the average American serviceman sincerely recognizes the suffering and hardships of the native people and does his best to be a good neighbor. We have been taught that we are guests of the people, not overlords, and we try to treat them just as we would Americans at home. That is beginning to be understood by the Vietnamese and more and more they are coming over to our side and divorcing themselves from the Vietcong.

"The Army has a people-to-people program and the Seabees have a Seabee technical assistance team, known as STAT, to help the people. They take machinery to build roads, build schools and churches, rebuild homes, drill wells, show how advanced techniques in farming can increase production, provide medical care, schooling and how to develop better government. Then, the South Vietnamese have organized a militia which is becoming more and more effective in policing the areas after the Vietcong have been driven out.

"The difficulty for Americans has been that whether you're on duty or not you're in real danger. You do not know when a Vietcong will toss a grenade, take a shot, fire a missile, or generally terrorize the area. For instance, our camp at Da Nang was hit on three different times. The first time on October 2, 793 men were wounded and flown to the Philippines and Japan to hospitals.

"Two days later we were hit again and then again on January 24. Then, on January 27, a patrol of 9 men on a search and destroy mission uncovered a Vietcong ambush 1,500 meters from our base and killed 17, captured 5, and destroyed 11 Russian-made 120 millimeter mortar tubes. The first two times we were hit with American-made 60- and 81-millimeter mortars. On the first two times there were more than 120 Vietcong, members of suicide squads, who had come into the area with the objective of taking our base with explosives strapped on their backs. Their bodies were found the next morning.

"But, the Vietcong's main objective is to harass troops, make them jittery and make American rebel. But, now they are not capturing the equipment that they did from Vietnamese, they are coming face to face with well-trained Americans and the shoe is on the other foot. The Americans are quite superior, have better techniques and equipment and are not about to be scared off.

"Folks at home shouldn't have any false notions about what Americans have to go through. For the first 4 months we were there we got a 4-hour leave every 10th Sunday. On those days we usually went into Da Nang, bought a few souvenirs, consumed a bit of alcohol, and came back. In Da Nang the Vietcong oftentimes would put acid in Coke bottles or put glass in ice cubes. The acid would eat the top off a Coke bottle in 10 seconds.

"But, times are changing as more and more Americans are taking the fight into the area, cleaning out pockets and driving them north. The biggest problems are guerilla bands resulting from the split of larger forces. But, as the South Vietnamese become more friendly and we cut off supplies from the north the guerillas are finding it more difficult to operate. Americans are developing their own guerilla warfare to cut off supply lines and combat the guerillas on their own terms.

"After 4 months we now have 6-hour leaves every 4th Sunday instead of every 10th Sunday. Then too, some men get rest and relaxation leaves of 3 to 7 days to Hong Kong, Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines.

"A big factor in upholding the morale of the servicemen has been the mail from home—folks who send a word of encouragement, cookies, books, magazines, and newspapers. This more than offsets the screwy protest marches and draft card burnings. The mailman makes us understand folks at home recognize what we are trying to do, that we are just trying to help people, as we did in previous wars, without any efforts to gain territory or special privilege.

"If Americans are to enjoy freedom they better help folks like the Vietnamese, who are now beginning to be real friends. We are beginning to earn the respect of the elder folks, who in turn appreciate what they are coming to find is the American desire just to help them. The real dividends will not be conquest, but freedom for human beings and their friendship. That's why we think our mission to Vietnam is worth while."

A YANK IN VIETNAM

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from a Navy medical corpsman from Maine who is serving in Vietnam. I quote from his letter:

Realizing that at any moment that my life could be ended with a Vietcong sniper bullet, or a hidden mine or boobytrap, I am nonetheless very proud and feel privileged to serve the State of Maine and my country over here. Although no one likes to live like an "animal" such as we are doing, most of us realize that it must be done.

This young man is Doug Guinard, of Shapleigh, Maine, serving at Da Nang, Vietnam. In his service he is even doing a great public service by writing a column entitled "A Yank in Vietnam" for one of Maine's finest papers, the Sanford Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that his excellent and fascinating column published in the February 3, 1966, issue of that newspaper be printed at this point in the body of the Record. I recommend it as "must" reading to all Members of Congress and to Americans at large.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HANOI HANNAH—LOTUS BLOSSOM OR HAG?

(By Doug Guinard)

Communist North Vietnam's answer to World War II's Tokyo Rose has been dubbed "Hanoi Hannah" by American GIs in war-torn South Vietnam.

The North Vietnam radio celebrity has been envisioned by some of the troops as an eye-appealing luscious lotus blossom; others say she's an old hazzled hag with a wart on her nose and stringy hair.

Regardless of what her physical appearance is, she gives the boys some kicks with her nightly broadcasts to U.S. troops, which provoke howls of glee. Unfortunately for Hannah, she's trying to be serious.

"Hey, guys," a marine will cry, "I'm getting that broad Hannah on the short wave."

"Crazy, turn it up so we can all hear it," someone shouts back.

"Maybe she'll play that Communist love song again."

"You mean the one about the militiaman and his plowhorse?"

"Yeah, yeah. Ain't it wild?"

"Hey, knock it off, will ya?"

The radio's oriental music fades. "Good evening friends," Hannah says stiffly. "A very warm hello from Radio Hanoi."

Laughter and wise comments come from her American audience.

"Talk to me, sweetheart," says a trooper, slapping his knee.

"What a dizzy broad," sighs another.

"Here I am, Hannay baby."

"Hey, shaddup so's I can hear."

Unlike Tokyo Rose in World War II, Hannah is all business. No sex and sensuality. No reminders of mom's apple pie or mental sniffs of the perfume on the girls every GI leaves behind in the States.

She comes on like a WAC sergeant. News first with comic coloring. Fiction and fishy fact. Hannah can really throw the bull, literally speaking, of course.

"The latest war tabulations on American casualties since July," she says precisely, "indicate more than 10,000 have been killed" (actual U.S. tabulation is about 1,200). "In addition, over 800 U.S. jet fighters have been shot down over North Vietnam" (actually about 175).

"Despite the continued aggression of U.S. imperialism, however, the people's liberation armies (Vietcong) are at all times vigilant and are ready to bring down more planes and kill more of these invading Yankee troops."

"Ain't that chick something?" a GI groans.

"What a mixed-up cat she is," another adds.

"She ain't too sharp on figures, is she?"

"Say, speaking of figures, I wonder."

"What kind of talk is that?"

"Man, that's 3 months away from woman talk."

Hannah's shows are invariably the same. After the news comes an editorial denouncing U.S. escalation of the war, then a recording by an Asian soprano who sounds as if she's having her ears pierced. Then mailbag time ("write us for the truth, friends").

There is no small talk, no intimacies, and no nonsense. This is just propaganda. Just another part of this weary war—and the only part, unfortunately, that one can just turn off.

A NIGHT ON THE FRONT

Dust settles over the Vietnam countryside and it becomes a different world. The wind rises and sends an eerie sound through the trees. Crickets and frogs start their nightly song. Darkness blacks out the familiar sights of the day leaving only treetops visible against the horizon.

And so begins another night of vigilance in Vietnam on the front. To the pros here it is just another sleepless night. To a new man it is an experience he will never forget.

Sandbagged bunkers surround the camp which houses the well-armed marines. Each bunker is covered with a small tent for protection against the elements, but rain always seems to find a hole. Some of the bunk floors are covered with several inches of water, adding to the discomfort.

Nerves are taut. A stick snaps. Was that a Vietcong or just a night animal on the prowl for food? Alert eyes strain to detect movement in the darkness.

A quick pop shatters the air as a flare bursts overhead giving everything a white frosted appearance. Moving shadows are cast on the ground as the parachute flare drifts downward and sputters leaving the night black and quiet again.

A lieutenant stops by a bunker and tells the marines a patrol is moving out through the woods to check Vietcong activity and will be returning at 3:30 a.m.

A drum sounds somewhere in the jungle, and is answered from across a rice paddy—the Vietcong are signaling each other.

Everyone in the bunkers waits. Hours drag by. Nearly every half hour a flare bursts in the sky illuminating everything below. Still, nothing unusual is seen.

The sound of a crying baby drifts across the rice paddy from one of the villages. Then a noise.

The word is passed. The patrol has returned. Now anything spotted outside the perimeter is the enemy.

A rustling in front of the perimeter prompts another flare. It illuminates a lone Vietcong moving toward the area. A machinegun shatters the night and the figure drops from sight. Another less dirty commie to worry about.

And as the early morning sun rises over the mountains, the men know that the same thing will happen again tonight when the same sun goes down.

Another night of hell will be here in a few hours.

INCREASED FEDERAL PER CAPITA AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS— RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Syracuse, N.Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to establish a tax-sharing formula to distribute to local governments a portion of Federal tax revenues.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the city of Syracuse is approaching its constitutional taxing limit for real property; and

Whereas per capita aid from the State of New York, although increasing, has not kept pace with the increased costs of operation of the city of Syracuse; and

Whereas extensive rent properties have been removed from assessment rolls of the city of Syracuse for the construction of State and Federal highway systems and other construction activities; and

Whereas various proposals are now before the Congress of the United States which would authorize a return to local governments of a portion of Federal tax revenues on a tax-sharing-formula basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the common council hereby approves the concept of increased Federal per capita aid to local governments and urges the Congress of the United States to immediately enact the necessary legislation to establish a tax-sharing formula to distribute to local governments a portion of Federal tax revenues; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the city clerk to the minority and majority leadership in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the people of Onondaga County.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION TO COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, concern has been expressed recently with respect to the current status and operation of the Small Business Administration. It would appear that this concern has arisen as a result of the failure of the President to appoint an Administrator for the Small Business Administration. This has led to much speculation that this agency will not continue as an independent entity but rather will be dissolved and absorbed by the Department of Commerce. This morning I read of a report that the President has decided against such a transfer of functions to the Commerce Department. I hope this report is true. However, until a decision to appoint a new Administrator is officially made by the President, I must consider the present independent status of the Small Business Administration in jeopardy, and do whatever I can to insure its continued independence. Furthermore, I am quite concerned over the agency's decision of last October to establish a moratorium on its direct business loan program, provided for under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act.

I know my colleagues share my anxiety over the failure of the President to appoint an Administrator for the Small Business Administration. This post has been officially vacant since September 13, 1965, a period in excess of 4 months. Logic and sound judgment require that this post be filled. The vital programs administered by the Small Business Administration are essential to the growth and development of small business; thus, they are crucial to the economic well-being of this Nation. These programs, however, can be carried on with effectiveness only if there is leadership within the agency to afford direction and purpose to its activity. In the absence

of such leadership, these programs would deteriorate, morale within the agency suffers and the small business community will feel frustrated in its attempt to secure proper aid and assistance which, under statutory authority, the Small Business Administration has a responsibility to render. I urge strongly that the President soon appoint an Administrator for the Small Business Administration.

It is my sincere hope that the failure to appoint an Administrator is not indicative of any plan or purpose to revise the status of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency. To afford maximum assistance to this Nation's small business community, it is essential that an independent agency exist, unfettered by other responsibilities not altogether compatible within, which is attuned to the character and interest of small business as well as sympathetic to its needs.

The small business community is a vital and important force within the social and economic fiber of this Nation. Small business not only deserves but requires the complete attention which only an independent agency can provide. This, of course, is not a new idea. The necessity for an independent agency was recognized at the time legislation was passed creating the Small Business Administration. There was an alternative bill before the Senate which would establish a Small Business Agency within the Departments of Treasury and Commerce. The President of the United States, then senior Senator from Texas, stated:

This bill would place the Small Business activities of the Government under two major Departments—Treasury and Commerce, and yet, practically all of us subscribe to the principle that a Small Business Agency cannot be effective unless it is independent.

Serving as junior Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the late President Kennedy confirmed these views. This view was expressed by our distinguished Vice President, then Senator HUMPHREY, as well as the chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, Senator SPARKMAN, the ranking minority member of the committee, Senator SALTONSTALL, and other distinguished Senators.

The logical, compelling arguments advanced and accepted when the legislation was enacted are even more valid today for we have had the experience of time to confirm the wisdom of these views. The Small Business Administration revolving fund authorization for fiscal year 1966 is \$1,841 million. It has requested a fiscal year 1967 authorization for this fund of \$1,966 million. There are six major programs of loan assistance administered today by the Small Business Administration, including the direct business loan program, title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act, displaced business and disaster loans and natural and economic disaster loans. That these programs have had an important impact and beneficial effect not only for small business, but for the general public as well, is evident; that these results are due in large measure to the status of the

Small Business Administration as an independent agency is also clear.

As I stated on the floor of the Senate last month, I am very concerned over the lapse of the direct business loan program occasioned by the moratorium imposed on October 15, 1965. There is perhaps no program administered by the Small Business Administration which is more important to the welfare and vitality of small business.

These loans have enabled the creation of new business and the expansion of old. Their benefits have been far reaching beyond economic assistance to loan recipients; they have resulted in economic improvement through expansion of employment and increased purchasing power. We are all witnesses to their impact. The Small Business Administration gave recognition to this as recently as February 7, 1966, in its press release No. 1783. This statement cited the considerable advantages and benefits realized under the direct loan program. The basis of this statement was a sampling which showed that Small Business Administration loans totaled \$14.2 million, enabling 145 small firms to hire 2,740 additional employees and nearly to double their sales. The release cited statistics to illustrate that these firms increased their employment 40 percent, and their gross sales 43 percent to a total of \$132 million annually. They have already paid back, with interest, \$6.2 million of the \$14.2 million borrowed. The release stated:

While the sample is, of course, too small to give an accurate and total measure of the economic benefits resulting from SBA loans, it does provide proof that Small Business Administration loans have a measurable impact in the community where they are made.

In spite of these benefits, the Small Business Administration has seen fit to suspend its direct loan program.

The support and sympathy of the Congress for the business loan program as well as other programs of the Small Business Administration are a matter of historical record. There is perhaps no other department or agency of the Government which has enjoyed a better reception in the Congress than does the Small Business Administration in its requests for funds to conduct its activities. Evidence of this is shown in the favorable response to the two requests of the Small Business Administration in calendar year 1965, for supplemental appropriations. These became Public Law 89-16 on April 30, 1965, for \$100 million and Public Law 89-309 on October 31, 1965, for \$160 million. However, neither of these supplemental appropriations contained funds for the direct loan program since in both cases no request therefor was made by the Small Business Administration.

I hope earnestly that appropriate and needed action will be taken soon to restore the Small Business Administration as an effective agency for rendering necessary and proper assistance to the small business community.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR MUNDT BY SOUTH DAKOTA KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have been singularly honored by a group of dedicated men from my home State of South Dakota. I have just received word from the State Secretary of the Knights of Columbus in South Dakota that a resolution was adopted in the recent convention of that organization commending me for my efforts to curb the flow of obscene and lewd materials which threaten the moral fiber of our country.

This resolution refers, of course, to the legislation which I have introduced to create a Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials. In this session of Congress, the bill is S. 309. In the 86th and 87th Congresses an identical bill was approved by the Senate Committee on Government Operations, and in both those Congresses the bill passed the Senate. However, no action was taken in the House.

I am happy to report that the Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor has held hearings and has reported an identical bill in this session of Congress. I am very hopeful that the bill will receive full committee approval and that it will pass the House of Representatives. If it does, I believe the Senate will again act expeditiously to give the bill the green light.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the notification which I have received from my good friend Ed Gebhart in which he reports the resolution which was adopted by the South Dakota Knights of Columbus.

There being no objection, the notification and resolution were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COUNCIL,
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
Orient, S. Dak., February 9, 1966.

HON. KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: The following resolution was adopted at the State Convention of Knights of Columbus of the State of South Dakota:

"RESOLUTION 10

"Whereas the Knights of Columbus as an Order of Catholic Men is deeply concerned with the future of America; and

"Whereas that future is being seriously threatened by increased sales and distribution of lewd, obscene and pornographic magazines, pictures and other materials, leading to the perversion of many of the peoples of our great country and especially our youth; and

"Whereas the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT, senior Senator to Congress from the State of South Dakota, has for many years made an intense and devoted effort to bring this to the attention of the Congress of the United States and to the people of our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the South Dakota State Council of the Knights of Columbus, in convention assembled at the city of Pierre, S.

Dak., this 24th day of April 1965, Do hereby commend Senator MUNDT for his great efforts on behalf of the citizens of our Nation and to pledge our full support to his untiring efforts in this regard."

Please be assured that all the great efforts you have made and are still making in combating obscene literature is being greatly appreciated by our organization.

Sincerely yours,

E. J. GEBHART,
State Secretary.

VISTA IN ALASKA—AN OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in remarks presented to this body yesterday I paid tribute to the contribution being made to war on poverty in my State by three VISTA volunteers formally with the Peace Corps.

I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to pay tribute to the more than 45 other VISTA volunteers working in Alaska.

The volunteers are working with Alaska native people. Many of them live in native villages. Unless a person is acquainted with living conditions in many of our native villages he will not appreciate the trying conditions under which these volunteers work.

Conditions in some villages are worse than conditions in the worst big city slums without taking into consideration the subzero winter climate.

Despite these hardships the volunteers are carrying on programs of health, education, and community development. They are helping to build sawmills, to develop water supplies, and to educate village residents. Most encouraging of all, the volunteers are being accepted by the villagers, who are anxious to improve their lot.

I am happy to report that now a group of VISTA volunteers is in training in Alaska. There is a need for a great many more.

Mr. President, I would say to prospective VISTA volunteers that while service in Alaska offers a great challenge, it also offers great opportunities to serve your fellow man. The opportunities are extremely varied.

Dennis Schmitt, serving the almost isolated area of Anaktuvuk Pass, has developed an easier system for natives to obtain fuel for heat. He is now teaching English by learning Eskimo from the natives.

Barbara and Fred Beaver, former schoolteachers, have helped change the attitude and morale of patients at the Anchorage public health center which treats poor Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts.

Patrick Fitzgerald arrived in arctic village in September 1965. He spent his early days in the village building his own living quarters and cutting wood, which he shared with a native who hauled it by dogsled to neighboring villages. He feels his daily association and service will enhance the possibility of his acceptance by the community, while also

February 18, 1966

of providing adequate housing for those Alaskans who, with one foot in the past and the other in the present, lack the means to acquire such housing themselves.

It is all too true that a large segment of our population lives under conditions which are not conducive to health and happiness. Too many of these Alaskans only subsist. Many dare not abandon the traditional ways of living in the rural areas because they know they do not have the education or skills which would allow them to live the better life of their fellow Alaskans in urban areas. And the old ways of eking out a living—trapping, fishing and hunting—are often uncertain today.

Many of our native Alaskans are indeed living between two worlds and enjoying the maximum benefits of neither. In damp, cramped, poorly ventilated dwellings, tuberculosis and other diseases take their hold, and a sickly person is little concerned with anything other than survival. Tuberculosis, that great ravager of our native people in years past, is still a threat to health and life in remote areas of Alaska. The tuberculosis death rate among Alaska natives, while down substantially from past years, is still five or six times higher than the rate for the general population of the Nation.

While this is basically a medical problem, better hygienic practices could bring about a reduction in the incidence of disease. Here is another area in which you can assist—educating villagers in such practices.

The 24 VISTA volunteers who have preceded you into rural Alaska are already playing a significant role in the effort to upgrade village life. Some villages never heard from are now part of the Alaskan community of the whole because of the efforts of VISTA volunteers. For example, results of a recent election in one such village were brought to the attention of interior Alaska residents through a letter written to a major newspaper by a volunteer living there.

VISTA volunteers are now conducting adult basic education and/or preschool education courses in 10 northern and western Alaska villages. Such educational programs are vitally need if our village people are to be brought into the mid-20th century.

At no other time in our history have conditions for improving the lot of our people been as good as they are today. We are indeed fortunate to have in the White House a sensitive, compassionate man who sees poverty as a degrading blight and is waging total war against it through such programs as the one in which you have enlisted.

Your very presence in the 49th State is evidence in itself of the dedicated concern and desire of individual Americans to exert every effort to constructively approach the task that will be done. The citizens of Alaska's capital city and of Alaska itself are proud that you are here. We are somewhat humbled that each of you is willing to make such personal sacrifice in behalf of helping your fellow human beings.

In concluding, I want to congratulate you on completing your training and thank you for the effort you will soon be making on behalf of fellow Americans who desperately need help. We cannot consider ourselves a truly prosperous nation until all of our people are leading healthy, productive lives. You realize this and are doing something about it, which is to your everlasting credit. As you prepare to leave for assignments far from your homes, I want to wish you success and a merry Christmas and happy New Year.

BASIC DISAGREEMENT ON VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Roscoe Drummond has, in his column published this morning in the Washington Post and

other newspapers, put his finger on the essential difference between the parties to debate over this Nation's Vietnam policy. And he has, with lucid brevity, summed up the argument and the lack of proof on the side of the critics that the United States really is committed to an unlimited war, as they contend.

Mr. Drummond's thoughts, Mr. President, deserve attention from all. I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSENSUS GAP: BASIC DISAGREEMENT ON VIETNAM

(By Roscoe Drummond)

It is all to the good to debate the administration's purposes and policies in Vietnam. But such debate brings some loose statements and misstatements which pass each other on the front pages and never seem to meet. They need to be sorted out to see where we all stand.

The central theme of the critics is that the United States is committed to a policy which leads to bringing Red China into the conflict.

These were the views expounded before the Fulbright hearings, principally by former Ambassador George F. Kennan and retired Lt. Gen. James Gavin. At this point, President Johnson countered by saying that he failed to see a great deal of difference between the Kennan-Gavin views and what the Government is doing. The retort to that soft answer was not long in coming. It was that the President was so sorely defeated in the argument that, being unable to debate with them, he had to say he agreed with them.

Obviously, Mr. Johnson did not in this instance add much to the debate. What is needed is to see where the administration agrees and disagrees with the Kennan-Gavin thesis.

They agree at several points: The United States has a vital stake in the peace and freedom of southeast Asia, should not quit fighting, should not pull out of Vietnam.

They disagree on strategy. The Kennan-Gavin view is that we ought to stay closer to safe enclaves, quit trying to find and destroy the Vietcong, and hang on until the Communists agree to negotiate.

Here you have your choice as to which strategy is more desirable: for the United States and South Vietnamese forces to take the war to the enemy or to let the enemy occupy more of the country and take the war to us.

But whichever side of this coin you prefer, there remains a crucial difference between the administration and the critics.

Are we involved in an unlimited war in Vietnam which can only lead to Peiping's entering it?

The President's position is that we are not conducting an unlimited war and that events even more than argument, prove it. It is shown in the fact that the United States is not using its vast power to attack the North Vietnamese people, is not trying to bring down the Hanoi government but to bring it to the peace table, and is keeping a careful checkrein on the bombing.

Why aren't these facts conclusive? To many they are, but some critics still contend that, while we may not be conducting unlimited war, we are committed to it because of our goal to secure self-determination for the people of South Vietnam by ending the aggression one way or another.

In judging this argument, which is central, I think you have to find against the critics. They offer no proof that we are committed to unlimited war. We are con-

ducting a limited war for a limited objective—to secure for the people of South Vietnam the right to choose their own form of government.

This may well mean a long war, as Gen. Earle Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has frankly said. But its purpose is to win our objective in a way that will not put us at war with Red China.

I suspect this makes sense to most Americans.

WHAT LOOMS AHEAD IN VIETNAM?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, next Monday noon I am scheduled to deliver an address before the Cosmopolitan Club of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., in which I am to deal with our American foreign policy, the war in Vietnam, and what is now emerging from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings in ever-increasing clarity as the outlines and guideposts of our policies.

To be sure that my views and observations are available to the President and to those charged with the responsibility of making the day-to-day tactical and diplomatic decisions in the delicate areas of our military maneuvers and our quest for peace, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of my address to be made in Sioux Falls be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT LOOMS AHEAD IN VIETNAM?

(Excerpts of address by Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, before the Cosmopolitan Club of Sioux Falls, S. Dak.)

With regard to Vietnam, the present mood in Washington reflects a growing conviction that no quick and easy peace terms are likely to evolve out of recent efforts to bring our Communist adversaries to the peace table or through the approaches being made through the U.N.

On the brighter side of the ledger, administration spokesmen appear confident that no sharp or serious escalation of the war in Vietnam appears likely on the basis of current information.

Out of the general floor debate in the Senate and the continuing public hearings being held by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, certain guidelines to our present and developing plans for Vietnam are becoming increasingly clear.

It is anticipated that President Johnson will take some early opportunity to summarize in a public statement the whys, wherefores, and whereto of our American position and plans in Vietnam. There is also a growing possibility that a declaration of policy updating and redefining our national policies in that area of the world may be coming from the President to Congress for debate and action.

Patience, punishment of the enemy, and pressures of accelerated intensity on both friend and foe appear to be the key factors in the administration's program as it is now being disclosed to public view in our committee hearing room by Government witnesses and the flow of information coming out of the questions and answers involved in the sessions of our Committee on Foreign Relations.

Patience is to be practiced in avoiding precipitous actions and in continuing the quest for peace through negotiations or U.N. actions. The enemy is to be subjected to steadily increasing punishment both in

February 18, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3287

sharing and learning of their daily village problems. It appears to be a sound approach. Recently the village requested that he help develop Headstart and adult education programs.

Bethel's variable population, 400 new residents last year alone in a town of 1,600, has made the task of its three VISTA volunteers difficult. John Shively works with villagers on a levee to keep back the spring's floods. Gay White and Julie Davis teach kindergarten and developing community relations programs.

At Chalkyitsik, a town of about 70, Steve Greenwald has tutored seventh and eighth graders, instructed adult education classes, helped return the post office to the town and secured a loan to start a sawmill.

Volunteers in Emmonak have organized activities ranging from a Headstart program to plans for a fish cannery. The ice was literally broken by Don Annotti, whose fishing expeditions won friends and support for the VISTA volunteers and their programs. Don and Carl Berger work in a sawmill, which they helped establish to provide timber for the village. Mary Seville and Pat Schultz, working as nurses' aids, have started a new wheat program. Community legal problems are now being solved by Mr. Berger.

Frank Warpeha is the lone VISTA volunteer at Fort Yukon, a community of about 700 Indians and 100 whites. Early he established an effective working relationship with the town's city council and has since become the only non-Indian to serve on that body. He has helped develop a preschool program, has begun adult education classes and visits every Indian family at least once a week.

Mary Coner and Betsy Reeve, working in Hooper Bay, have gotten their former college sororities to contribute school supplies for the village's first preschool program. Gary Barclay has organized a special school for village students who are hindered by language barriers. He also conducts adult education classes which are so popular they often last until 1 a.m.

In Hughes, James Weidner has an adult education program underway. At the request of the city council, he is providing an advisory service, helping develop programs of social reform.

Lennie Kamerling, on a year's leave of absence from Franconia College, has developed a unique program along with residents of Kasigluk. In order to teach English, Kamerling and the villagers have compiled an anthology of poetry. As a result of their efforts, this community project will soon be published. Kamerling is doing the photography, but the writing—in English—and illustrations are the work of the Eskimos.

Linda Keen and Sheryl Mark have opened up the first public library in Kiana after collecting 2,000 books. They conduct medical self-help classes, an adult education program and a Headstart program.

As a result of Ted Zachara's efforts, an after-school study hall and a recreation program have been established at Nome.

Judith and Harold Bruce, working along parallel lines, have begun scouting programs in Noorvik. Judith is also teaching in a Headstart program, while Harold has developed projects focusing upon the recreational needs of the area's youth.

Kenneth Pletter is teaching a full schedule at remote Point Hope. He supplements daily tasks by giving his free time to serve as advisor and legal counsel to the villagers. All these volunteers began working in Alaska this fall. Twenty-seven additional volunteers have been serving in 12 Alaska villages since December. Already these efforts have brought results.

William Engelke and James Miller have been conducting adult education classes and a youth recreation program at Akhiok.

Florence Wagner, a practical nurse, has begun a health program at Dillingham. This project will undertake the training of inhabitants to employ the basic rules of personal and home hygiene. Margaret Bracken has instituted a community action program and helped to create a volunteer fire department.

Paul Hoxie and Robert Mandeli have developed plans for a Headstart program for Hydaburg.

Kathleen Goggin, R.N., is busy treating seasonal upper respiratory problems at Kwethluk. In less hectic moments, she visits homes spreading practices of good hygiene. Steve Gage and Chris Fisher are teaching adult education courses.

Judy Anderson, Chatty Cornelius, and Howard Smith have been conducting Headstart classes and adult education programs at Kwigillingok. Thirty children attend the Headstart program.

Doug Wolf, working alone, has begun to develop community action projects in Manakotak.

Twenty adult residents of Mekoryok are attending basic education classes, conducted by Jeffrey Keahon and Eric Hager. The two volunteers have plans to organize a cooperative through which the indigenous poor could sell milk for cash income.

Charles Hofheimer has been tutoring a Headstart program which 23 children are attending at New Stuyahok.

Registered Nurse Barbara Feeny has been fighting a hepatitis epidemic since arriving at Nondalton. Cherie Guy and David Walker have worked with the healthy in adult education and youth recreation programs.

Bonnie Archbold, Robert Shuler and Teresa Wolfenbarger have opened a child-development center and have begun a community action program at Nunapitchuk.

In Old Harbor, which was desperately in need of a nurse, Helen Dietz, R.N., has made tremendous strides. Diana Bunker and Robert Danielenko have filled another void. They are presently teaching English to preschoolers as part of a new Headstart program.

Barbara and John O'Hara in Togiak are carrying out a full schedule as VISTA volunteers. A typical day includes holding morning classes for adults,

afternoon child-development programs and an evening devoted to tutoring high school students.

Mr. President, Gov. William A. Egan gave an excellent address at graduation ceremonies for the volunteers in December. In the speech Governor Egan described what the volunteers would find in our native villages. I ask unanimous consent that the Governor's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY GOV. WILLIAM A. EGAN, GRADUATION OF VISTA VOLUNTEERS, JUNEAU, ALASKA, DECEMBER 10, 1965

It is a pleasure to be with you tonight on this important occasion—important with respect to your own lives and to the State of Alaska. You soon will be embarking on a great adventure of service to your fellow man, and there cannot be a more meaningful adventure than this.

I am sure the year of your life you will be giving to assist fellow Americans who desperately need a helping hand will be one you will never forget. You are assured of a rewarding experience—in personal gratification, not material terms—and you will have a keener sense of human value when your year comes to an end.

You have undergone 2 weeks of intensive training in the art of existing and traveling in rural Alaska. You have read about the people who inhabit these areas. During your 3 weeks of residence in villages of southeastern Alaska you gained some understanding of the needs of these Alaskans. This is only the beginning, however. In the next year you will gain an education that could never be acquired in a formal institution of learning.

Most of you, I understand, will be assigned to areas of western and southeastern Alaska. Here you will face a great challenge, perhaps the greatest of your life. Much remains to be done to assist the native peoples of southeastern Alaska make better lives for themselves. But in other areas of the State this task is so staggering that only through the combined efforts of the Federal Government, State and local communities can it be successfully accomplished.

Poverty is poverty no matter where it is found. In certain remote areas of Alaska it is unusually acute. You volunteers will have your work cut out for you. I am sure some of you wonder precisely what you will be doing in the villages to which you will be assigned—and I am equally sure that after you have arrived you will find yourselves extremely busy. If you did no more than articulate the special, pressing needs of these villages, you would be performing a great service. But with your education and training—and your desire to lend a helping hand—you will be able to do much more. In no other situation would you have such an opportunity to use your own judgment and implement ideas. It should be kept in mind the villages in which you will serve have asked for you. And always remember that the fine Alaskans with whom you will be working are able, intelligent citizens.

Living conditions in the villages of western and southeastern Alaska will undoubtedly shock some of you. Housing is woefully inadequate. Mrs. Marie McGuire, Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, commented after touring this area last month that she had never seen worse conditions.

Mrs. McGuire had come to Alaska to participate in the Alaska Native Housing Conference, the first such conference ever held. Its purpose was to consider ways and means

South and North Vietnam in the hope such punishment will convince the Communist aggressors that their hope for conquest is futile and that a long war will prove devastating to their unholy plans.

Pressures are to be mounted on our friends and allies to cease delivery of supplies to Vietnam; to join us in our defense of freedom in southeast Asia, and to use their good influences and economic pressure to help convince the Communist leaders of Hanoi, Peking, and Moscow that the era of winning new territory and subjecting free people to tyranny by military conquest is over and that today's world will no longer countenance the promotion of area wars of aggression which might lead to global conflict.

It is to be hoped that an early clarification and crystallization of our American position and policies in Vietnam will help produce a national unity of purpose in this cruel war which will help convince our Communist foes that neither dissension in the ranks of our public officials nor a division among our people will cause our Nation to accept defeat and to surrender another large area of the free world to the grasping tyranny of godless communism.

Intelligence reports indicate that our adversaries read into our differences of opinion far more than is intended so that the net result is to discourage the aggressors from coming to the peace table and to encourage them to continue fighting even after commonsense begins to tell them military victory has become impossible.

MR. CLEAN WATER

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I read with interest a story in the supplement of the February 6 Sunday Washington Star.

Written by Orr Kelly, and entitled "Mr. Clean Water," it is about Mr. Murray Stein, chief enforcement officer of the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Public Health Service.

It is always gratifying for me to see public officials given due recognition, particularly Mr. Stein. He has worked with the water pollution control program since its inception. His was the key role in the development of that program.

From 1948 to 1955 in the General Counsel's Office, and since that time as chief of enforcement, he has developed policies in all aspects of the attack on pollution contained in the new Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Mr. Stein was a key man in establishing the program of Federal grants to municipalities for the construction of waste treatment facilities. He led the development of a suggested design for State pollution control laws, as a result of which more than half the States have improved their pollution control legislation since 1948.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. CLEAN WATER

(By Orr Kelly)

It is not true that everybody hates Murray Stein.

Why, there are people who don't even know him.

But the hate level is high among those he has dealt with.

Psychologists tell us that hate is actually a projection of our own feelings of guilt and inadequacy onto someone else and Murray Stein has made himself a prime target for those who have reason to feel guilty about polluting the Nation's rivers, lakes, and streams.

"Unless you've been on this spot," he said the other day, "you just can't imagine the pressures and the vilification we're subjected to."

His official title is Chief Enforcement Officer of the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Public Health Service.

He is sometimes known more simply as Mr. Clean Water.

He speaks with an accent that betrays his Brooklyn background and almost always uses the plural pronoun "we" so that, from one sentence to another, it is difficult to know whether he means "I" or "Peter Kuh (his assistant) and me" or all the 300 people in his branch.

Murray Stein is a short man with a round, almost cherubic face and a round belly that rolls out over his belt, the result of countless luncheons, banquets, and excessively nourishing hotel, and restaurant meals eaten at odd hours as he whips back and forth across the country in a single-minded and unrelenting battle against pollution.

"We'll go anywhere, do anything to clean up the water," he says. "We'll talk to a Congressman *** we'll make a speech *** we'll do anything to get people moving."

"We're always pleading *** pushing *** needling *** threatening."

Over the last decade, this pleading and threatening has resulted in the cleanup—or specific, enforceable plans for the cleanup—of 8,000 miles of American waterways. But in the process, Stein has come into bitter conflict with a virtual who's who of American industry and with the politicians of some of the Nation's major crisis—whose inadequate sewage treatment plants are among the major sources of pollution.

Through formal enforcement conferences—usually called by a State Governor—Stein has managed to cut the level of radiation in the Colorado River, convince the city of Detroit to stop dirtying the Detroit River, set in motion a cleanup of Lake Erie, get New York and New Jersey moving on the problem of the filthy Hudson, clamp down on the release of pesticides into the Mississippi, and get the cities and industries around Lake Michigan working together to keep the lake from becoming a cesspool.

Stein has conducted 38 conferences, concerning 1,200 cities and an equal number of industries, from United States Steel to a small, family-owned rendering plant. Almost every conference has involved "a real tough situation *** a long-festering sore."

The formal agreement that usually comes out of such enforcement conferences is just the beginning.

"We're not interested in what's on paper," Stein says. "We're not interested in a semantic cleanup. You can't fool any of the people any of the time that way anymore."

Stein demands a program of action—and he demands that it be carried out.

"As long as a guy goes along, we'll do anything to help," Stein insists. "We'll put a staff at his disposal, we'll meet with him any time or any place. We'll be on the phone any time he needs us."

"But if he says he's going to do something by the 18th and it isn't done, there'll be a letter on his desk on the 19th asking why not."

"If he balks, we put on constant pressure. We're always leaning."

Stein and his staff can also be sympathetic when polluters run into tough technical or financial problems.

In Chicago, representatives of the Federal Government, the States of Illinois and Indiana, the city of Chicago, and industry have been meeting for more than 6 months to try and work out some difficult technical problems.

"We've met 26 times in the last 6 months—an average of 3 working days every 2 weeks. They thought they could do it in 6 months but they strove mightily and failed. So we've extended the time."

Stein tries to be in his office in Washington on Mondays and Fridays, keeping the middle days of the week free for travel. In his office, he makes it a practice to take the papers out of his in-basket in the order they come, taking the tough decisions right along with the easy ones.

When he's out of town, he is almost automatically somewhere west of Washington and thus has the advantage of the time difference. He rises religiously at 6 a.m.—although he is seldom in bed before midnight—and frequently spends a half hour on the phone to his Washington office making the decisions that will keep his staff busy for the day. Except when he's flying—about 100,000 miles a year—he's usually close to a phone. Once, when he was driving in Hawaii, a highway patrolman pulled him over to tell him Washington wanted him on the phone.

His staff thus feels the Stein presence even when he is far away. Some of them hate it and go so far as to call it meddling. Others "try to butter me up," he says. The rest are indifferent.

"We don't care," he says. "If a man produces and is interested in clean water, we can adapt to wide extremes in character."

Stein, who was at the top of his class at George Washington University Law School, has managed to surround himself with bright people.

"Smart," he exclaims. "We don't have anything else but smart guys. What we're looking for is production. We've got some real hot shots and we let them go full speed. We'll give a guy as much delegation as he can swallow. We'll keep him busy as long as he wants to work."

A sizable amount of Stein's time outside Washington is spent with members of his field staff.

"I'm in Washington. I can talk to other people," he explains. "But the guys out in the field are alone. They've got the loneliest, hardest job in the world. Our first function is to keep them going, to back them up. They're subjected to rigorous pressure—personally, technically, professionally."

Stein's home, which he manages to visit once in a while, is at 4116 Elizabeth Lane, Fairfax. He has a wife, Anne, and two daughters, Toby Jean, 19, an American University student, and Judith, 14, a freshman and a cheerleader at Woodson High School.

At \$16 a day, Stein's Government per diem allowance doesn't come close to covering his costs away from home. His loss, he figures, is about \$1,200 a year.

"I complain about pollution," he said during a recent interview in his \$14-a-day motel room in Atlanta. "You know what my wife complains about? She says: 'You're not only away from home all the time, but it costs you money, too.'"

"I AM A TIRED AMERICAN" ROLLS ON

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, out in Luverne, Minn., a great and widely read editor, Alan C. McIntosh, editor-pub-

lisher of the Rock County Star-Herald, sat down some weeks ago and batted out on his typewriter his inner-most reactions and frank observations concerning this great country of ours and some of its deviations from the concepts which have made it great and kept it strong. He expressed himself under the heading: "I Am a Tired American."

Since that editorial appeared it has been printed and reprinted in many areas of the country. In last week's highly regarded and widely circulated news magazine, U.S. News & World Report, it was the featured piece on the page usually reserved for the observations of the great and good David Lawrence, himself.

In last Sunday's issue of the Daily Argus Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., the largest newspaper in a five-State area, Bob Renshaw, the roving reporter for the Argus, wrote a fascinating feature article about Al McIntosh and his unusual editorial. I ask unanimous consent to have that feature printed at this point in my remarks, together with the editorial itself, for the benefit of those who may not have read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIVERNE PUBLISHER GETS NATIONWIDE
RESPONSE

(By Bob Renshaw)

LIVERNE, MINN.—Pent-up frustration over changing attitudes toward America and Americans led Alan C. McIntosh, publisher of the Rock County Star-Herald, to write an editorial, "A Tired American Gets Angry." In the latest issue of U.S. News & World Report magazine, it appears on David Lawrence's editorial page.

"I doubt if I could write it again and sometimes wonder if I really did write it," he said in telling of the huge amount of correspondence it has generated. He said he doesn't know how many hundreds of newspapers, including a small weekly in Cordova, Alaska, have reprinted the editorial. It has also been used in Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic publications.

McIntosh pointed out that he is older than the average father of a 17-year-old daughter and that since she was 4, the family has done considerable traveling, including several trips abroad. During these trips he has observed a changing attitude toward Americans and an arrogance which has built up in many foreigners with whom he came in contact.

References heard overseas and at home to "Ugly Americans," reflections on trying to share a measure of good things we have as Americans with the rest of the world and finding ourselves practically friendless, and frustrations over some of America's policies led McIntosh to write the editorial in haste.

It was set into type and lay around for several weeks, coming close to being thrown into the hellbox before extra type was needed on the editorial page one day last May. Representative ANCHER NELSON, Republican, of Minnesota, had it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and newspapers reprinted it.

Letters began arriving from people of all walks of life, including the beatniks. But 98 percent of them, McIntosh said, "were beautiful—almost beyond belief." He indicated that for an editor who is accustomed to being damned for what he writes, it is a pleasant change of pace to have 7 out of 10 letters say "God bless you."

"The letters are repayment enough for handling the aftermath of 'The Tired American,'" he continued. Six or seven letters a

day began arriving and McIntosh answered each one with a personal reply. Then the New York American reprinted the editorial and "the roof fell in," he said. By mid-November it was necessary to resort to a form letter in answering correspondence.

He referred to demonstrations against our Government and the American way of life. "If anyone thinks these pickets are representative of majority opinion in America, they are wrong," he continued. "There are, thank God, plenty of 'squares' still around. There is a spark of patriotism running deep in more hearts than you can imagine and these letters prove it."

McIntosh looks on anti-American demonstrators as scum on the water. "It could pollute us, but I doubt that it will," he concluded.

A Tired American Gets Angry

"I am a tired American.

"I'm tired of being called the ugly American.

"I'm tired of having the world paupers use my country as a whipping boy 365 days a year.

"I am a tired American—weary of having American embassies and information centers stoned, burned, and sacked by mobs operating under orders from dictators who preach peace and breed conflict.

"I am a tired American, wearied of being lectured by General de Gaulle (who never won a battle) who poses as a second Jehovah in righteousness and wisdom.

"I am a tired American, weary of Nasser and all the other bloodsucking leeches who bleed Uncle Sam white and who kick him on the shins and yank his beard if the flow falters.

"I am a tired American * * * choked up to here on this business of trying to intimidate our Government by placard, picket line and sit-in by the hordes of the dirty, unwashed who rush to man the barricades against the forces of law, order, and decency.

"I am a tired American, weary of the beatniks who say they should have the right to determine what laws of the land they are willing to obey.

"I am a tired American—fed up with the mobs of scabby-faced, long-haired youths and short-haired girls who claim they represent the 'new wave' of America, and who sneer at the old-fashioned virtues of honesty, integrity, and morality on which America grew to greatness.

"I am a tired American, weary unto death of having my tax dollars go to dictators who play both sides against the middle with threats of what will happen if we cut off the golden stream of dollars.

"I am a tired American * * * nauseated by the lazy do-nothings who wouldn't take a job if you drove them to and from work in a Rolls Royce.

"I am a tired American—who is tired of supporting families who haven't known any other source of income other than government relief checks for three generations.

"I am a tired American who is getting madder by the minute at the filth peddlers who have launched America in an obscenity race * * * who try to foist on us the belief that filth is an integral part of culture * * * in the arts, the movies, literature, the stage (and the mobs who see Lenny Bruce as brightly amusing and Norman Mailer as compelling). I'm tired of these artists who scavenge in the cesspools for inspiration and who refuse to look up at the stars.

"I am a tired American—weary of the bearded bums who tramp the picket lines and the sit-ins—who prefer Chinese communism to capitalism—who see no evil in Castro, but sneer at President Johnson as a threat to peace.

"I am a tired American—who has lost all patience with that civil rights group which is showing propaganda movies on college

campuses from coast to coast. Movies denouncing the United States. Movies made in Communist China.

"I am a tired American, who is angered by the self-righteous breast-beater critics of America, at home and abroad, who set impossible yardsticks for the United States but never apply the same standards to the French, the British, the Russians, the Chinese.

"I am a tired American who resents the pimply faced beatniks who try to represent Americans as the bad guys on the black horses.

"I am a tired American who is weary of some Negro leaders who, for shock purposes, scream four letter words in church meetings.

"I am a tired American—sickened by the slack-jawed bigots who wrap themselves in bedsheets in the dead of night and roam the countryside looking for innocent victims.

"I am a tired American who dislikes clergymen who have made a career out of integration causes, yet send their own children to private schools.

"I am a tired American who resents those who try to peddle the belief in schools and colleges that capitalism is a dirty word and that free enterprise and private initiative are only synonyms for greed.

"They say they hate capitalism, but they are always right in the head of the line demanding their share of the American way of life.

"I am a tired American who gets more than a little bit weary of the claue in our State Department who choose to regard a policy of timidity as prudent * * * the same group who subscribe to a 'no win' policy in Vietnam.

"I am a tired American—real tired of those who are trying to sell me the belief that America is not the greatest nation in all the world—a generous-hearted nation—a nation dedicated to the policy of trying to help the have-nots achieve some of the good things that our system of free enterprise brought about.

"I am an American who gets a lump in his throat when he hears the 'Star Spangled Banner' and who holds back tears when he hears those chilling high notes of the brassy trumpets when Old Glory reaches the top of the flagpole.

"I am a tired American * * * who wants to start snapping at those phoney high priests who want us to bow down and worship their false idols and who seek to destroy the belief that America is the land of the free and the home of the brave.

"I am a tired American who thanks a merciful Lord that he was so lucky to be born an American citizen—a nation under God with truly mercy and justice for all."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a long time ago an editor by the name of William Allen White made quite a reputation for himself writing an editorial entitled, I believe, "What's Wrong With the State of Kansas?" Writing as he does about a far larger and more important subject, it appears probable that Al McIntosh is about to attract to himself national attention even beyond that which attached itself on that occasion to Mr. White.

THE BRAVE PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, February 16 is a day that should be remembered by all of us. On this day, 48 years ago, the brave people of Lithuania declared their independence from Russia, after having been dominated by this powerful country for more than 120 years. Great progress was made in this Balkan nation in education, social wel-

fare, and transportation, and after so many years of subjugation its people knew the taste of democracy. The spirit of the Lithuanian people earned the admiration of the world.

After 22 years of peace and prosperity, however, the citizens of Lithuania became the victims of ruthless invasion and oppression. In World War II the Soviet Empire engulfed this defenseless country, and the chains of slavery once again bound the Lithuanians. Since that time they have lived under the tyranny of Russia. However, their spirit of freedom has not been crushed. Harsh repression cannot quench the hope of a people who have the spirit of freedom so deeply rooted in their hearts and minds.

We cannot for one moment forget these victims of communism. The burning hope of the brave Lithuanians to once again live in peace cannot be allowed to dim. Lithuanian Independence Day is a day not only for recalling the bravery and spirit of the Lithuanian people, but for remembering also the millions of people under the iron hand of slavery in other parts of the world. We salute Lithuania on this day, knowing that their desire for freedom has not faded.

SENATOR TOWER SPEAKS OUT ON VIETNAM

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, many of our distinguished colleagues have been joining in recent days in the increasing dialog about Vietnam. It has come to my attention that the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] has presented his views to his State in a special public service television appearance.

In order that other Senators may have an opportunity to share his views, based on his recent, extensive tour of the combat area, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of that program be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR JOHN TOWER SPEAKS OUT ON VIETNAM

ANNOUNCER. This is Vietnam. Why are we there? What kind of war are we fighting? When will it end? Although thousands upon thousands of words have been written about this distant, tormented land, many of us here at home remain troubled about what we're doing there—where we're heading—what we can do to end the fighting.

Texas' U.S. Senator, JOHN TOWER, is intimately acquainted with the problems of Vietnam. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator Tower has been to southeast Asia. He has talked with and worked with all the top American officials involved in this frontline struggle against Communist aggression. He has been in the field. He has learned from the American men and officers on the scene their assessment of the war. Senator Tower has recently returned from this tour-in-depth of the explosive southeast Asian region. Back in Washington, he reported what he saw and heard to fellow members of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Capitol press.

Senator Tower. The most impressive thing is the fighting quality of the American soldier. I think this is by far the best generation of fighting men we've produced.

They're hard chargers, they'll go day in and day out. They don't gripe. They have high morale. And, they're doing a good job for the American people * * * there's a general feeling that we should close the harbor at Haiphong. They feel that there are a lot of supplies coming through there. The SAM's—surface to air missiles—are being brought in through Haiphong. They feel that we should interdict the northeastern railway spur into China. There's a feeling that some of the targets that we are now expending tons of ordnance on and risking the lives of American flyers are of questionable value. And I think we should go after targets that will really hurt these people * * * that really will reduce their capacity to wage war and their willingness to fight a war out of North Vietnam.

ANNOUNCER. With his intimate knowledge of the situation which exists in southeast Asia, Senator Tower has been asked by the Texas Congressional Report Committee to bring to the people of our State the story behind the story * * * blunt, plain talk that will help each of us to better understand the significance of a war that's being fought half a world away.

Senator TOWER. Vietnam is, indeed, a troubled and troubling land. It is not easy to trace the history of how we got there. Now we're there, it's not easy to understand why we're there. Nor is it easy to predict what lies ahead. Communism does not choose battlegrounds that will be easy for the defenders of freedom. We have today in Vietnam some 200,000 of the bravest, most talented, best trained American soldiers who ever have defended the interests of the United States. They are spread the length and breadth of South Vietnam—in the jungles, the swamps, the mountains and the coastal sands.

Our 1st Infantry Division—the Big Red 1—and our 101st Airborne Division—the Screaming Eagles—face the Communists around Saigon. In the strategically vital midsection of the country we have committed our new, powerful, helicopter-equipped 1st Air Cavalry Division and jungle-trained troops from the Hawaii-based 25th Infantry Division. They operate from such bases as Pleiku and An Khê. To the north, hard by the 17th parallel, the 3d Marine Division is dug in defending Chu Lai and Da Nang. Throughout the central highlands and along the borders with Laos and Cambodia are stretched the dozens of fortified camps manned by our elite special forces troops * * * bastions of liberty in a sea of Red guerrilla activity * * * the fighting specialists of green beret fame.

I inspected the advance camp of the U.S. special forces at Buon Ea Yang near the Laotian border. These troops, often called America's fierce frontline guerrillas, live up to their reputations. One of the interesting twists to my tour of this camp came when I was shown a new elementary school which was completed last fall. The special forces unit supervised the construction and paid for all the nails and the chains used for swings. One hundred and seventy-five children are being taught by four teachers in this remote Rhade tribe village; a side of the story rarely told of our participation in this war.

Besides these major ground units, the U.S. Air Force has men and planes operating from such bases as Bien Hoa, Tan Son Nhut, Cam Ranh Bay, and Nha Trang. In addition, there are air support bases in Thailand—only a few miles away across the narrow reach of Laos. Off the coast lie the ships of the U.S. 7th Fleet. Small river craft and coastal patrol boats play relentlessly back and forth interdicting the Red's sea supply lines.

From the decks of the carriers, Navy pilots contribute their strength. And from the sup-

port ships comes covering gunfire to back up our land artillery. And, behind this massive commitment of U.S. force—some 10 times more than we had in Vietnam a year ago—lie the support facilities of the Philippines * * * Subic Bay Naval Base and Clark Airfield at Manila. Beyond, in the Pacific, are the Guam base of the Strategic Air Command and the headquarters and supply facilities of Hawaii * * * where only a few days ago President Johnson met with leaders of South Vietnam to pledge whatever is necessary to contain the spread of communism in southeast Asia.

So, this is the present U.S. commitment to Vietnam. It approaches the manpower we placed in Korea a decade ago, and it vastly outstrips Korea in terms of firepower and maneuver capability. This is not a commitment to be lightly regarded. It was placed in southeast Asia because we mean business * * * and we mean for the Communists to understand that. I was tremendously impressed by the American men who are helping defend the independence of South Vietnam. These men are hard fighters.

Texas—I should add here—is well represented among the dedicated men of our historic 101st Airborne Division. As well as in other units such as the 3d Marine Division in combat areas around Da Nang—up near the big pressure point around the 17th parallel dividing North and South Vietnam. We toured this area with Maj. Marc Moore from Dallas.

At the Da Nang hospital, I talked with casualties of a hundred nameless but bloody skirmishes. We stopped in the village of Le My which is renowned for Vietcong raids and ambushes and saw firsthand the war's impact on civilians. I was briefed by one of our Navy doctors on the worsening health conditions which pose a threat worse than the guerrillas.

Fighting men like these are doing a magnificent job for the free world. They're stopping communism in its tracks, and they believe it's worth the effort. America wants peace. We want nations left alone by their neighbors to grow and prosper as they will. Last April, President Johnson accurately defined our position in this struggle when he spoke in Baltimore.

President JOHNSON. Our goal is to guarantee the independence of South Vietnam.

Senator Tower. We want a peace lesson to be learned by the Asian Communists today—in this small country—just as it was learned by the Russians in Europe and Latin America. By standing firm today, we are avoiding a bigger battle later. By standing firm today, we are doing all we can do to guarantee peace for the world's future.

Vietnam cannot be divorced from the long-term, main-event struggle against communism. This confrontation with the Reds has been going on throughout the 20 years since the end of World War II. Vietnam is but an episode in a drama that previously involved Berlin, Iran, Turkey, Greece, Italy, Malaysia, the Philippines, Korea, Cuba, Lebanon, and the Dominican Republic.

This drama began in 1949 when a land blockade of Berlin's Allied sectors was started April 1 by the Soviet military government, which refused to permit United States and British supply trains to pass through the Soviet zone of Germany. This blockade and a Western counterblockade were lifted September 30, after British and United States planes had airlifted over 2 million tons of food and coal into western Berlin.

We were put to the test again in Korea early in the 1950's. And later when attempts by several factions to undermine the pro-Western administration of Lebanon led to open revolt in May 1958. President Dwight Eisenhower sent marines in reply to Lebanon's call for help and Great Britain sup-

ported the American position. The revolt dwindled and American forces were withdrawn in October 1958.

And then the showdown in Cuba * * * when the Soviet offensive buildup was revealed to the American people by President Kennedy, who ordered a naval and air quarantine on shipment of offensive military equipment to the island—the showdown which saw Soviet Premier Khrushchev order the missile bases in Cuba dismantled.

We continue to have such episodes because first the Soviet Communists and now the even more aggressive Chinese Communists have thought they can eventually have their way by fighting. They are wrong, but they certainly will not be convicted of that if we abandon Vietnam.

The United States is not at fault in this battle, as some of the peaceniks and beatniks would have us believe. The United States did not attack across a sovereign boundary in Korea. The United States did not blockade Berlin nor build a wall. The United States did not crush Hungarian freedom with the weight of tanks. The United States did not subjugate the Cuban people. The United States did not send guerrilla terrorists into Venezuela or Colombia or the Dominican Republic. The United States did not break the Geneva accords by terrorist attacks in Laos and South Vietnam.

America has been on the right side of these events. Communism has been in the wrong. It is communism which continues to endanger world peace and world order. It is America which defends world order and strives for world peace.

I'm sure no loyal American believes we should stand by indifferently while communism takes over the rest of the world. I take it for granted that every intelligent person realizes America could not long survive as a free nation in a world that was completely communistic outside of America. And, I believe everyone agrees that somewhere, somehow, we must draw the line against further Communist expansion in Asia, just as we have drawn it in Europe.

The question that has troubled some Americans, therefore, is not whether such a line should be drawn, but where such a line should be drawn. I think we have been right in drawing the line in Vietnam. Because, if this line falls, it will be infinitely difficult, perhaps impossible, to draw any realistic line of defense any place short of Hawaii.

We need but look at the map to see the strategic geographic position of southeast Asia. Here, of course, are the Vietnams, Laos, and Cambodia. The area we used to call Indochina. All this area is being actively threatened by the Reds. Right next door in Thailand, the beginnings of Red guerrilla terrorism has been detected. Should Indochina and Thailand fall to aggressive Asian communism the Reds would have opened new doors for the export of subversion, not only across the South China Sea toward the Philippines, Malaya, Indonesia, Australia, and New Zealand; but even more importantly, across the vast Indian Ocean which washes India and Pakistan the vital and always volatile Middle East; and no less than eight nations of Africa.

If South Vietnam falls to communism, there is virtually no hope Laos and Cambodia can hold out. Thailand, Burma, Malaya, and Indonesia would feel strong pressures to seek an accommodation with the Communists. Should the Reds then gain a foothold in Burma, the coastal invasion route into India and East Pakistan would lie exposed to Communist exploitation. India's flank would be turned. Should the Reds gain a dependable foothold in the islands of Malaysia and Indonesia, the Philippines would be threatened from three sides, and

the unprotected northern coast of Australia would invite infiltration.

And, should the Reds gain control of the crucial sealane at Singapore—the Straits of Malacca—all free world shipping could be forced into long, and more dangerous detours perhaps clear around the underbelly of Australia. Therefore, the interests of our Nation and of the entire free world are involved in preventing communism's capture of such a key area of the world.

We are in Vietnam, also, because it is in our national interest to assist every nation, large and small, which is seeking to defend itself against Communist subversion, infiltration, and aggression. There is nothing new about this particular policy. It is a policy, in fact, to which America has been committed since the Marshall plan of the 1940's. When this policy was adopted some 20 years ago, the free world was just beginning to learn about the methods of Communist conquest.

In the years just after World War II, we saw those nations which were occupied by Soviet armies deliberately remolded into Red regimes. This liquidation of opposition occurred throughout Eastern Europe. Outside the nations occupied by Soviet troops, there lay a tier of nations left in confusion and poverty by the ravages of World War II. In these nations, the Reds mounted internal subversion controlled from the outside by Communist masters. Eventually, the Communists made armed bids to overthrow existing governments. This was the aggression we confronted and defeated in Iran, Greece, and Turkey.

Next, the Communists did away with pretense and openly invade the Republic of South Korea with Red units supplied from bases outside the attacked country. Allied armed forces came to the aid of South Korea, and remain on guard there.

Having seen their previous tactics of conquest thwarted, the Communists now have shifted to what they call wars of national liberation. This method combines internal subversion with an elaborate and reprehensible reign of terrorism and with eventual introduction into a nation of Communist troops from outside. That's what we are up against in South Vietnam today. The fate of the people of South Vietnam is of the same vital concern to Americans as was the fate of others we have helped.

Today, we face an aggressive Communist China which adheres to the militant Red philosophy displayed by Russia two decades ago in Europe. The Chinese Communists have made it clear that Vietnam is another test of their strategy for conquest.

However, the Chinese Reds have shown an understanding of free world power. There is no place in the world the Chinese Reds would rather have than the island of Formosa. But, they recognize the massive force America can and will bring to bear to prevent their invasion of that island. This same appreciation of U.S. power has prevented the Chinese Reds from directly confronting the United States in South Vietnam.

Quite bluntly, Red China has too much to lose at home. If she were to intervene in Vietnam, American jets could easily reduce her budding nuclear industry to ruin and virtually wipe out all her other limited industrial capacity.

We should say something here about this word "sanctuary." All Americans recall that in the Korean war, our Nation granted the Red Chinese sanctuary behind their own borders. That is, despite the Chinese intervention into the Korean war, we never bombed the supply lines and troop concentration points just across the Yalu River in Chinese Manchuria. We have indicated to the Communists that this time there will be no sanctuary. Indeed, our selective bombing

of pinpoint military targets in North Vietnam illustrates that we will not allow the aggressor nation safe sanctuary in which to build, regroup, and support attacks.

Knowing she cannot expect sanctuary, Red China must weigh what she has to lose at home against what little she could realistically hope to gain by intervening directly in South Vietnam.

In addition, Red China faces formidable supply problems in any anticipated intervention into South Vietnam. The part of China bordering North Vietnam, Laos, and Burma is not a major industrial area as was the Manchurian border with North Korea. It has only poorly developed transportation facilities and is in most cases mountainous, difficult terrain. Supporting an army across such a region would be extremely difficult for Red China. Our air power could destroy bridges and railroads in short order. Therefore, our military strategists frankly estimate that Red China could not put enough troops into southeast Asia to turn the tide of war against a determined effort by the United States, South Vietnam, and our allies.

Thus, Red China's threat to world order and liberty can be effectively halted in this place and at this time in world history. It can be blunted today at far less cost to the free world than would be needed in a confrontation a few years hence. We must remember that by the 1970's, the Red Chinese will have a limited nuclear weapon capability, and that within the decade of the 1970's, they will have some medium-range missiles with nuclear warheads. Any attempt to achieve order in southeast Asia at that time would be fraught with far more danger and difficulty than we face in confronting today a nonnuclear Red China.

Therefore, we are in Vietnam not merely to help the 14 million South Vietnamese defend themselves against communism, but because also at stake are the independence and freedom of 240 million people in southeast Asia, and the future of freedom throughout the Western Pacific, India, and Africa. We are also in Vietnam because we have pledged to assure the independence of South Vietnam, and America stands by her word.

The record of Communist aggression in South Vietnam is conclusive. Beyond question, North Vietnam is carrying out a carefully conceived plan of aggression against the south. This aggression violates the United Nations Charter. It is directly contrary to the Geneva accords of 1954 and of 1962 to which North Vietnam is a party. That Geneva agreement came after the French were driven out of southeast Asia by anticolonialistic forces. Geneva accords set up both North Vietnam and South Vietnam and carefully provided that neither was to attack or attempt to subvert the Government of the other.

North Vietnam promptly ignored the Geneva accords and began its systematic terrorism in the south. The people of South Vietnam have chosen to resist this threat. They have taken thousands of casualties doing it. At their request, the United States has taken its place beside them. So have South Korea, Australia, and New Zealand.

The United States seeks no territory from this war, no military bases, no favored treaty positions. If peace can be restored in South Vietnam, the United States will be ready at once to reduce its military involvement. But, we will not abandon friends who want to remain free.

Our first national priority is and must ever be the survival of our country and the survival of a world climate of freedom in which our country can grow and prosper. And, if the 20th century has taught man anything, it is that survival and freedom cannot be purchased cheaply, in a discount store or bargain basement.

February 18, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

Since World War II America has preserved freedom and national independence in more than half the earth. We have prevented nuclear holocaust. We have restored Western Europe and Japan. We have helped friend and former foe to achieve prosperity, liberty, and stability. We have launched the United Nations, and we have kept it alive. We have offered the hand of friendship to the less fortunate in this world, if they will but take our hand. It may be said of America today, as of no other nation in history, that whenever people are willing to stand up in defense of their liberty, Americans will stand with them.

This is the historical road that has led us to Vietnam and this is the road which will lead us to world peace. The United States cannot, then, retreat from these heavy tasks assigned to us by history and liberty.

We must do what is necessary to assure independence for South Vietnam and stability for the Western Pacific. We can win in Vietnam, and by winning we will be going a long way toward establishing world order and world peace for the future.

How then, are we doing? What lies ahead? Our recent efforts to bring the North Vietnamese to the conference table failed. We have bent over backward and walked the extra mile in presenting our peace proposals throughout the world. We must continue these peace efforts. However, since the Communists have refused these approaches and are continuing their terrorism and aggression in South Vietnam, we must now intensify our military efforts until we convince them that we are serious and that they can neither win nor afford to continue the conflict.

Looking at the situation in South Vietnam now, I believe it is correct—as Defense Secretary McNamara has said—that we have stopped losing the war. However, we have not yet taken decisive steps to start winning it. Until we do, it is not likely the Reds will accept peace talks.

Both the American troops and officers I saw in Vietnam and Thailand indicated to me that they believe additional steps are necessary if the fighting is to be ended promptly with no unnecessary loss of life. These men also said they were willing to do their part. Our military efforts must, therefore, continue.

The President may find it necessary to increase the American manpower on the ground in South Vietnam and to interdict the Ho Chi Minh trail. If this is militarily necessary to speed the end of the war * * * then I will support him and I hope all Americans will support him.

It may become necessary to destroy certain North Vietnamese industrial plants by bombing—perhaps plants near Hanoi. If this is militarily necessary to speed the end of the war, I hope all Americans will support the effort.

It may become necessary to close the port of Haiphong. This is the port through which most of the Red's military supplies are received. Through Haiphong come the anti-aircraft missiles that have been shooting down American pilots.

It should be pointed out that it is possible to close this harbor and to deny these supplies to the north without resorting to a formal ship blockade. Mines can be placed across the harbor closing it to shipping without any U.S. ship being stationed on the scene. There need be no danger of a naval confrontation over this harbor closing.

If this Haiphong harbor closing becomes militarily necessary in order to speed an end to the war, I hope all Americans will support the move.

There are other steps we can take to assist our men in Vietnam. We can, and we should, provide them with the new lightweight M-16 jungle rifle. This M-16 rifle

is particularly well suited to the type of combat they face. It is being built in increasingly large numbers, and should be furnished to our men.

These are just a few of the things we can do and may need to do to bring this war to a close and to bring the North Vietnamese to the peace conference table.

I think it should be pointed out that our soldiers, airmen, and marines are involved in far more than combat in South Vietnam. They are doing far more to contribute to eventual peace and stability than meeting the enemy on the battlefields. They are building schools, roads, and ports. They are teaching local leaders how to govern. They are teaching about sanitation, giving out soap and food, tending sores and wounds and tropical diseases—all in marked contrast to the terror of the Vietcong, who close schools and even force children and women into combat situations.

I believe Americans can be particularly proud of the way our men are responding to the challenge of defeating communism and simultaneously building an intelligent, orderly, free society for South Vietnam. I believe Americans can be proud of our Nation's continuing dedication to the cause of liberty.

Sometimes it seems that every generation of Americans is called upon to make sacrifices in blood and treasure to preserve freedom. As I visited the hospitals, I saw sights no American could soon forget. And yet, the wounded men I saw understood—just as the American people must understand—that we are making our stand in Vietnam today to preclude a fight on a much broader front at much greater cost later on.

We can keep this conflict from spreading. We can bring it to the conference table. We can guarantee the independence of South Vietnam. We can do our part to preserve world order. We can do our part in achieving a lasting peace for mankind.

The opposing of tyranny always is hard, but never is useless. The quest for peace never is easy, but always is worth the effort.

ANNOUNCER. Thank you, Senator Tower. This special program has been brought to you as a public service. Senator JOHN TOWER, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, who has recently completed an extensive trip throughout the combat zone and who has talked and worked with all the top American officials involved, was asked to speak bluntly on the current situation in South Vietnam and the prospects for the future. If you would like to have a printed transcript of this plain talk on Vietnam by U.S. Senator JOHN TOWER, please send your name and address on a card or letter to Senator JOHN TOWER, Federal Building, Austin, Tex.

A CRUCIAL SITUATION IN THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on the 27th of January of this year I expressed my concern to my colleagues in the Senate in regard to the fact that since October 11 the Small Business Administration has been unable to even entertain applications for assistance under their loan program. Since that time this crucial situation has become more aggravated.

In my own State of Rhode Island there are approximately 25,500 small businesses which employ about 122,000 employees. Rhode Island is without question a State whose economy is made up primarily of small business. In fact 94.8 percent of our industry is considered small business by the SBA. As a Sen-

ator from Rhode Island I am impelled to speak out about the future of our small businessmen.

In our desire in this administration to create a Great Society, we should not create a society that would allow the small businessman to disappear, like the Whooping Crane. In saying this I recognize that Rhode Island small businessmen are an extremely hardy lot; and congratulate them on their hardiness. They have survived the exodus of major textile industries to the south, an extremely complex and sometimes arbitrary tax structure, and the increasing lack of skilled labor.

But, as you know, Mr. President, the two main reasons for failures of small businesses are first, lack of management capabilities and second, lack of sufficient capital. Rhode Island small businessmen have proved by their very survival that they have first-rate management capabilities. However, before a small business can grow and prosper, it must have sufficient capital.

Mr. President, when I spoke on this problem on January 27, I made reference to a telegram that I addressed to Ross D. Davis, Executive Administrator of the Small Business Administration, in which I expressed the plight of a small businessman in Rhode Island. I should like to ask unanimous consent at this time to insert into the Record the reply I received from Mr. Davis on December 28, 1965.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PELL: This will reply to your telegram of December 23 regarding our moratorium on the acceptance of loan applications.

I very much regret that the financial condition of the agency necessitated this action. A number of factors contributed to this unsatisfactory condition, as explained in the enclosed statement I made on December 15, 1965, before the Senate Select Committee on Small Business.

For several months we have been devoting a major portion of our resources to the processing of over 25,000 disaster loan applications resulting from Hurricane Betsy, as well as to the backlog of business loan applications. These two problem areas, to a considerable extent, now have been resolved and we are approaching the position where we can estimate how much money will be available for regular business loans during the remainder of the fiscal year. We presently are considering how our lending programs will be adjusted and to what extent loan applications again can be accepted consistent with our remaining financial resources. We hope this determination can be made in the near future.

Please let me know if I can be of further service to you.

Sincerely,

ROSS D. DAVIS,
Executive Administrator.

Enclosure.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, since that time my office has received urgent telephone calls about this crisis; for example,

one Rhode Island small businessman has received blanket orders for his product from two major corporations who are working on high priority defense contracts. This businessman does not have enough capital to purchase the necessary supplies to meet these requirements. The SBA refused to even accept an application from him for a direct loan and the local banks categorically refused to participate in the SBA loan guarantee program. I can assure you, Mr. President, that this small businessman is not alone. There are many others like him who are in a similar predicament. This, of course, is not a Rhode Island problem alone. It is a national problem, but because of the large ratio of small businesses in my State, it is of more acute concern to Rhode Island than it is in many other areas of the country.

I have noticed several articles in the past few weeks on this very subject. At this point, Mr. President, I would like unanimous consent to insert these into the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 16, 1965]

SPARKMAN CHARGES SBA HALTS SMALL BUSINESS LOANS

(By William J. Raspberry)

The Small Business Administration has virtually stopped making loans to small businessmen, "the very thing for which it was founded," Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, charged yesterday.

SPARKMAN, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, said it was deplorable that the SBA has frozen applications for business loans except those in which banks participate.

Ross D. Davis, SBA executive administrator and sole witness at yesterday's hearing on what SPARKMAN has called "the virtual collapse" of the agency's loan program, said the freeze, in effect since October 11, was temporary and had been made necessary by a shortage of funds.

"Temporary or not, the effect was to cut off loans to small businessmen," SPARKMAN asserted. He noted that Congress was in session at the time the loans were cut off, and said the SBA could have asked for an additional appropriation.

Under SPARKMAN's questioning, Davis acknowledged that Congress had appropriated "everything we asked for," including a supplemental appropriation of \$160 million to cover loans to Louisiana businessmen hit by Hurricane Betsy last September.

SBA officials have blamed the hurricane for depleting the agency's money supply.

Yesterday, Davis made only passing reference to the hurricane, pointing out instead that "SBA must compete with all other agencies for its share of the Federal dollar." He noted that "Federal agencies all over Washington" are having budget difficulties because of escalation of U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

Davis also said SBA is receiving a record number of loan applications because of a tight-money situation triggered by the generally high loan-to-deposit ratio of banks and the recent action of the Federal Reserve Board in raising its bank discount rate from 4 to 4½ percent.

The SBA traditionally has made business loans to persons or firms unable to borrow through normal commercial channels.

Asked about the SBA's lending program under the Economic Opportunity Act, Davis said his agency has "enough money to carry this out, despite reports in the press."

There has been some criticism that SBA no longer is accepting loan applications from firms that would hire the poor, but is limiting its antipoverty loans to persons certified as poor on the basis of income.

The hire-the-poor loans had constituted the bulk of the SBA antipoverty effort and their curtailment has "cut the heart right out" of the agency's role in the war on poverty, critics contend.

Following the hearing, Davis told a reporter that the curtailment was designed to "stretch" the agency's \$35 million loan fund and that there was not enough money to handle both the "poor" and "hire the poor" loans.

SMALL BUSINESS LOSING U.S. LOANS—AGENCY REFUSING NEW BIDS FOR ITS CREDIT PROGRAM UNTIL FURTHER NOTICE—LACK OF FUNDS IS CITED—MONEY STILL BEING PROVIDED FOR DISASTER RELIEF AND ANTIPOVERTY PROJECTS

WASHINGTON, November 2.—Small Business Administration is refusing to accept applications for its ordinary small business loan program until further notice.

A spokesman confirmed today that the cutoff in applications began October 12, though no announcement was made at the time. The reason is a lack of funds.

The agency will continue its antipoverty program of very small loans, running up to \$15,000. It will also continue its program of guarantees of private bank loans, which can run as high as \$350,000.

The Small Business Administration asked Congress for \$450 million for its loan program for the present fiscal year, based on a recent record-high loan level of about \$100 million a quarter.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS APPROPRIATED

Congress, however, approved only \$150 million in new funds plus the right of the SBA to relend funds it receives in repayment of past loans, making an estimated total of \$291 million in all.

Contrary to reports, the agency's difficulty has not come about because it has used up its funds making disaster loans. Congress approved a last-minute appropriation of \$160 million for disaster loans, which should cover the present heavy lending activity, chiefly in Louisiana.

However, officials said today that much of the agency's manpower is occupied with the Louisiana situation, following the hurricane designated as Betsy. Thus, a backlog of some 3,000 business loans, applied for before the current freeze, has piled up awaiting final approval.

BACKLOG TO BE CLEARED

The first order of business after the Louisiana situation is in hand, officials said, will be to clean up this backlog. Then at some point applications will again be received for new loans, though there will probably have to be some restrictions.

Demand for SBA loans has been exceptionally high in part because of the booming economy and a resulting generally strong demand for credit.

It may also reflect some tightening of lending policy by private banks, which are more nearly "loaned up" than at any time in recent years, as measured by the ratio of loans to deposits.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 21, 1965]
DISASTER LOANS DRY UP SBA Aid to NEGROES
(By Leonard Downie, Jr.)

Emergency disaster loans to Louisiana businessmen hit by Hurricane Betsy in September have dried up funds for the Small Business Administration's regular loan programs throughout the Nation.

Hardest hit by the SBA loan drought are

the Nation's small businessmen—many of them Negroes—who had applied for loans through the new Small Business Development Centers in 28 U.S. cities.

Applications are no longer being accepted at the centers for regular SBA loans. A backlog of applications for special easy-to-get Economic Opportunity Act loans has built up. And many applicants who have actually received letters approving their loans have not received their money during the past 2 months.

NEEDED: \$160 MILLION

Little of the money is expected to be disbursed, and few new loan applications will be considered, SBA officials say, until Congress approves \$160 million in supplemental appropriations to foot the bill for Hurricane Betsy and cover the backlog of other applications.

Negro businessmen, meanwhile, are growing restive, as what seemed a promising program to help them enter the economic mainstream has come to a virtual standstill.

They especially had been counting on receiving from the SBA the Economic Opportunity Act loans that require little or no collateral; collateral has been a major stumbling block in their efforts to obtain loans before.

"I know there are some Negro businessmen in Washington who were already budgeting money they expected through the program," James S. Stanback, Jr., president of the District of Columbia Chamber of Commerce said. "Now, with no money coming, they don't know what they are going to do."

CENTERED ON NEGROES

The Small Business Development Centers were set up by the Office of Economic Opportunity in 14 cities last July to provide business training and assistance in obtaining SBA loans for needy small businessmen, especially Negroes.

In Washington, only six Negro businessmen had obtained SBA loans in 13 years before last summer. More than half of the 145 loans approved through the local center since then have gone to Negroes.

Nationwide, the number of cities served by the centers quickly doubled, with dozens of requests for them coming from other towns, as the public response exceeded all official expectations.

But now the loan money has suddenly stopped coming. Samuel Harris, director of the Washington center, reported that the SBA stopped accepting applications for regular loans some time ago.

He also estimated that 40 local applications for poverty program loans, budgeted separately by the SBA, are still awaiting SBA approval and that more than a dozen local businessmen who have received letters approving their applications still have not gotten any money.

Berkeley Burrell, president of the National Business League, said the situation is much the same at centers all over the country. Representatives of the league's chapters in cities with Small Business Development Centers "are calling every day to complain about the sudden lack of loan money," he said.

NEW CENTERS CURBED

The SBA also is not allowing new centers to open up in cities asking for them, he added, and Washington's center has two new branches, both staffed and already open for business, that cannot be announced to the public.

Burrell believes that the special effort to help Negro businessmen was never expected to cost as much as it has. "Now that it is adding to the Government's money problems," he said, "I'm afraid they will curtail it sharply or cut it off."

SBA officials insist that Hurricane Betsy is the only reason for the loan embargo. Emergency disaster loans needed in Louisiana, which get top SBA priority, are expected

February 18, 1966

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9
(Introduced by Mr. Renning)

A concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to direct the Bureau of Public Roads of the U.S. Department of Commerce to adjust certain administrative policies immediately so that the planning and construction of Interstate 90 highway in South Dakota, may be completed with a minimum of permanent economic hardship to the land area and the adjacent land area severed

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):

Whereas administrative policies of the Bureau of Public Roads have not considered the economic impact of Interstate 90 on the agricultural businesses and livestock operations in the semiarid country of South Dakota; and

Whereas under present administrative policy of the Bureau of Public Roads a sufficient number of practical sized land service facilities cannot be included in the design of Interstate 90; and

Whereas cattle and equipment passes should be justified on the basis of need rather than the Bureau of Public Roads present policy that these access facilities must be justified on the basis of the monetary value of severance damages minus the cost of the structure; and

Whereas there is a need for the Bureau of Public Roads to establish administrative flexibility in recent national policies for land service access facilities for cattle and agricultural pursuits which will not force South Dakota operators to sell their units and not make agricultural units unworkable and impossible to manage; and

Whereas proposed changes have been submitted to the Bureau of Public Roads for approval by the South Dakota Department of Highways which represent a sincere attempt to minimize the detrimental impact the Interstate has on certain land holdings which have incorporated sound engineering practices and resulted in a reduction in cost of federal expenditures and these proposals have been rejected; and

Whereas Interstate 90 construction from Cactus Flat to Chamberlain must be accomplished recognizing it is in the public interest to construct an adequate number of cattle and equipment underpasses even though the reduction in right-of-way damages of an individual severed is insufficient to offset the cost. Policy must consider multiple owner use and the area economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 41st Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and is memorialized to direct the Bureau of Public Roads of the United States Department of Commerce to make administrative policy changes in regard to access structures included in Interstate 90 which will allow these facilities at reasonable intervals based on need considering the land use of the area and the economy of the area; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States, the members of the congressional delegation from South Dakota, the administrator of the Bureau of Public Roads of the U.S. Department of Commerce, and to the South Dakota Department of Highways, Pierre, S. Dak.

Adopted by the house of representatives January 28, 1966.

Concurred in by the senate February 2, 1966.

LEM OVERPECK,
Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.

CHARLES DROZ,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

Attest:

PAUL INMAN,
Chief Clerk.

VIETNAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the question of just who is the Vietcong is apparently a riddle to many. An editorial in the February 16, issue of the Baltimore Sun illuminates the issue.

The Sun editorial asserts that "the evidence available suggests the National Liberation Front and the Vietcong are creations of North Vietnam, as fronts for that government rather than for the people of South Vietnam."

The Sun believes that "President Ho Chi Minh is being unrealistic as well as unreasonable when he says, as he has been saying in his letters to heads of state around the world, that 'if the United States really wants peace, it must recognize the National Front for the liberation of South Vietnam as the sole genuine representative of the people of South Vietnam, and engage in negotiations with it.'"

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sun editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Feb. 16, 1966]

FRONT FOR HANOI

One of the questions which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee could usefully take up, as part of its inquiry into the war in Vietnam, is the status of the National Liberation Front and the Vietcong. The evidence available suggests that the National Liberation Front and the Vietcong are creations of North Vietnam, in the familiar authoritarian pattern of Communist-sponsored fronts and "people's democracies," and hence are controlled by North Vietnam as fronts for that Government rather than for the people of South Vietnam.

Thus, President Ho Chi Minh is being unrealistic as well as unreasonable when he says, as he has been saying in his letters to heads of state around the world, that "if the United States really wants peace, it must recognize the National Front for the liberation of South Vietnam as the sole genuine representative of the people of South Vietnam, and engage in negotiations with it." From the American viewpoint, negotiations with the National Liberation Front under such conditions would be nonsense. We would be negotiating with a puppet, talking to mouthpieces manipulated by others. The United States has made the point that the Vietcong-Liberation Front could be represented along

with North Vietnam in any peace negotiations.

Senator McGEE, of Wyoming, discussed the role of the Vietcong-Liberation Front in a Senate speech February 1, citing the book by Prof. Bernard Fall as an authority. Much the same evidence was covered in press dispatches yesterday from Washington, referring to an analysis made for President Johnson. Senator McGEE urged Americans to disabuse themselves of the idea that the Vietcong-Liberation Front is "some endemic development within the borders of South Vietnam, some sort of peasant rebellion against Saigon." No non-Communist political group in South Vietnam—students, Buddhists, Catholics, liberals, or military—has embraced or endorsed the Vietcong, he noted. None has acknowledged the validity of the Liberation Front as a grassroots or native-controlled South Vietnamese political group. At the most, Senator McGEE said, it is no more than "one of the smaller of the (special) interest groups" in South Vietnam. For example, he said, the Hoa Hao and the Cao Dai are minority political groups which are larger than the Liberation Front.

Senator McGEE did not have a very large audience in the Senate. He is not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, but some of its members would serve the cause of public enlightenment if they would help to amplify our knowledge of just what the Vietcong-Liberation Front is, and is not. This could enlarge the public understanding which President Johnson needs as a foundation for support of his position on peace negotiations.

WEST VIRGINIA AVENUE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the February 13 issue of the Sunday Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail State magazine carried an article by Mr. Harry W. Ernst, Washington correspondent for the Charleston Gazette, regarding West Virginia Avenue, here in the District of Columbia. His remarks provide for the folks back home a verbal panorama of the sights to be viewed by traveling the length of this broad avenue.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OUR STREET IN WASHINGTON
(By Harry W. Ernst)

WASHINGTON.—There aren't any hills along the avenue named for West Virginia here, which is somewhat seedy and obscure with out its namesake's redeeming natural beauty.

Few West Virginians among the thousands who have visited or moved to the Nation's Capital probably know where West Virginia Avenue is. And understandably so. It's off the marble monument circuit.

Dedicated in 1909, West Virginia Avenue begins at K Street about a dozen blocks northwest of the Capitol. Rose & Jake Market ("meat, poultry, fish, and beer") and a hedge-filled island guards its entrance.

About 20 blocks later after a confusing encounter with Montana Avenue, West Virginia Avenue fades away just beyond the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks.

An old car with a flat tire parked in a backyard and trash-littered sidewalks remind the visitor of a typical West Virginia hollow. West Virginia Avenue also looks rundown and almost forgotten.

But it has two claims to fame—the 100-acre campus of federally financed Gallaudet College, the world's only college for the deaf, and one of two District of Columbia auto inspection stations that anger and help protect motorists.

In West Virginia all you do to get an inspection sticker is drive in to see your friendly neighborhood mechanic. It's not that easy in Washington. The police operate the two inspection stations, which are equipped with imposing machines that check your machine. And what human dares argue if the police machines insist that his machine is sick and needs treatment?

Those who don't like to leave home could stick around and even be buried along West Virginia Avenue, which Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, recalls visiting as a boy on a patriotic pilgrimage with his father.

Along the avenue are row houses, a Roman Catholic school, service stations and garages (including Washington's "Little Detroit"), used car lots, restaurants, a liquor store, warehouses (eggs, coffee, liquor, and furniture), and Mount Olivet Cemetery.

A narrow four lanes and partially lined with sycamore trees, West Virginia Avenue fails to live up to the beauty of its namesake. At its intersection with Florida Avenue, for instance, there is a small plot of ground bearing a sign that reads "No ball playing on this park, U.S. Park Service," although it's difficult to imagine anyone but ants playing ball there.

West Virginians might want to set an example for other States with Washington avenues named for them by sending contributions to beautify West Virginia Avenue. For those with States rights sentiments, such a gesture would symbolize their ambition to reverse the flow of handouts from Washington.

More than \$800,000 already has been donated by citizens from throughout the Nation to help Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson make the Nation's Capital a more beautiful city. Some elementary school children in California even contributed \$1.21 to the cause.

The District of Columbia government is seeking Federal funds to replace and repair deteriorating housing in a half square mile area bordering on West Virginia Avenue.

But that's peanuts compared to the millions which Federal officials hope to spend rebuilding Pennsylvania Avenue, the Nation's ceremonial boulevard that links the White House and the Capitol.

West Virginians will have to settle for a more attractive West Virginia Avenue. They can do their share by sending contributions to the National Park Service. Trees, shrubs, and flowers—perhaps some native to West Virginia—would perk up the old avenue in the image of its namesake, especially if the old car is left in the backyard.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTAL MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 2791.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

THE MEANING OF VIETNAM

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the subject of our foreign policy in southeast Asia. I believe that in Vietnam we face a momentous decision—one which may well determine the world position of the United States, for good or ill, now and in the years to come.

It was my privilege to serve in the Department of State during World War II and in the postwar period. Those were the years when the fateful crises which have since matured first came into being. That was the time when we rejected a "heathen trust" in the atomic equivalent of the "reeking tube and iron shard" as the means for imposing a Pax Americana on a prostrate world.

We chose instead the path of peace. Peace through international understanding and cooperation. We placed our trust in the good will of mankind and what we believed was an indomitable human instinct for survival in the post-Hiroshima age.

We laboriously set up an elaborate international machinery for keeping world peace. We did so not with any utopian or messianic vision of what it could accomplish. We merely hoped that our handiwork would be strong enough and flexible enough in future years to control, or at least contain, the crises which were even then foreseeable if and when they were triggered by a new type of aggression and a new breed of aggressors.

We found that even this modest hope was illusory. We learned 20 years ago that U.S. power and the unflinching will to use it was the only effective deterrent to Communist aggression.

It is my hope that the insights and experience gained in those years may prove to be a useful resource to the Senate in its discussions of our course in Vietnam and in assessing its implications for the future of our Nation.

THE SOUTHEAST ASIA RESOLUTION OF 1964

I was not a Member of the Senate when it passed the southeast Asia resolution in 1964. I have, however, read carefully the resolution itself and the legislative history connected with its adoption. In submitting that resolution to the Senate for its overwhelming approval, the floor manager for the legislation made it clear:

The resolution now before the Senate is designed to shatter whatever illusions our adversaries may harbor about the determination of the United States to act promptly and vigorously against aggression.

When asked by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky whether the resolution gave the President authority "which could lead us into war," the chairman replied:

That is the way I would interpret it. If a situation later developed in which we thought the approval should be withdrawn, it could be withdrawn by concurrent resolution."

I agree with the purpose of the resolution and the interpretation of its possible implications as expressed by the distinguished chairman. I believe the resolution was a dramatic endorsement by the Congress of the solemn pledge made by the late President Kennedy in his inaugural address, where he said:

Let every nation * * * know that we shall pay any price, bear any burden * * * support any friend, oppose any foe to ensure the survival of liberty.

The menace of trigger happiness to world peace was an issue in the presidential election of 1964. Yet the people of the United States endorsed by overwhelming majority the confidence of the Congress in the President's ability and determination to preserve world peace while acting to deter international aggression.

What then is the record of the President's efforts to keep peace in southeast Asia?

As Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, he has ordered military action to preserve the independence of South Vietnam. I believe that action is a responsible, necessary, and restrained use of the minimal force required to deter the present level of aggression in Vietnam and to honor our national commitments.

As Chief of State he has brought home to the leadership of very nation on earth and to all the people of the free world two messages:

First. Our desire for an honorable and peaceful settlement which will insure the independence of South Vietnam.

Second. Our determination—if no honorable settlement is possible—to protect the liberty of the gallant people of South Vietnam "as long as aggression commands us to battle."

In his search for a peaceful and honorable settlement he has shown a combination of patience, resourcefulness, and initiative which I believe to be without precedent in the annals of the Presidency.

He has enlisted the assistance of every relevant organ of the machinery for international cooperation established since World War II.

He has even sought and obtained the assistance of the Soviet Union and of other Communist and nonaligned powers of Europe, Africa, and Asia to use their influence with Hanoi to open the door to negotiations.

He sought and enlisted the great moral influence of His Holiness, Pope Paul, who has urged arbitration of the Vietnam controversy under the aegis of the United Nations.

In an age of instant global communications he has combined the prestige of Presidential diplomacy with the power of the mass media to communicate to the world at large the sincerity of our Nation's desire for peace with honor.

February 18, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

At considerable risk, he ordered a suspension of bombing of strategic targets in North Vietnam to convince the aggressor that our purpose was not to destroy him but merely to deter his aggression.

He has appealed to Hanoi directly, only to have his appeal spurned on the ground that the United States would not be permitted to gain at the conference table what it was unable to win on the field of battle.

This record is the eloquent evidence by deeds, not words, of the patience and skill with which the President has discharged his pledge to seek every road to peace in South Vietnam. But the Peiping-Hanoi aggressors have spurned his every effort. Their brinkmanship has compelled him to resume the use of military forces to deter their mounting aggression.

The calculated risks which this course entails are minor when compared to the disaster the Nation invites if it fails to pursue it. For we face an enemy whose primary technique of conquest is not by military victory on the field of battle, but by the psychological exhaustion of his adversary.

At this time what could better serve our adversary's purpose than undermining the President's leadership by destroying the faith of our people in the justice of the cause for which we fight in Vietnam and of its vital importance to the United States?

In the present supercharged and emotional setting, a deliberate and thoughtful approach by the Congress to its constitutional responsibility in the Vietnam crisis would be enormously difficult, if not impossible. The Nation's confidence in its free institutions to function at a time of clear and present danger would be eroded—perhaps beyond repair. The mutual trust and confidence now existing between the President and the Congress would be impaired.

The best possible preventive of any such occurrence is to build an informal national resolve as the lifeline of our national purpose in Vietnam.

I profoundly believe it is the Senate's constitutional responsibility to contribute to this process. In the best interests of the Nation—and to strengthen the hands of the President in the days to come—I respectfully submit that the Senate's contribution must be informed and responsible.

THE NEED FOR SENATE DISCUSSION

The New York Times for January 29, 1966, carried an account of the questioning of Secretary of State Rusk by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It quotes the chairman as saying:

In my long career in Congress I've never seen so much apprehension over a military involvement. I've never encountered such a complex issue. This is a subtle thing—unlike the invasion of South Korea by Communist forces from the north or the bombing of Pearl Harbor * * * there is a lack of understanding of the situation in Vietnam.

I agree with these remarks of the distinguished chairman. There is great apprehension about our military involve-

ment. The Peiping-Hanoi aggression is, as he says, a "subtle thing." Nothing like the traumatic shock of the Japanese assault on Pearl Harbor or the sudden Communist invasion of South Korea.

But it is not unique. Twenty years ago the United States was confronted with an early model of the Communist technique of externally controlled conquest designed to take over small nations from within, masquerading as a "civil war of national liberation."

That was during my tour of duty as Assistant Secretary under then Secretary of State Byrnes. At that time the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was the late and beloved Tom Connally and the distinguished leader of the minority was the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg.

Then the names of the arenas were Iran, Greece, and Turkey—the early harbingers of our present confrontation in Vietnam. Let me repeat. We learned then that there was only one deterrent the Communist aggressor respected. It was not the moral influence of the United Nations. Or what is known as world opinion. It was American power backed by the will to apply it.

The present lack of understanding of the Vietnam situation, in my opinion, is due primarily to the fact that the people have been confused as to what the war really involves.

Millions of words on the Vietnam war have been printed by our enterprising mass media. Our pundits and nationally syndicated columnists have maintained a steady stream of pontification. Radio and television have outdone themselves in spectacular on-the-spot reporting and have gone in for daily in-depth interpretation of the news.

This plethora of information and opinion is difficult to digest even for the most sophisticated and reflective American. For many, it just is not assimilable. They are simply bewildered.

Moreover, the inherent complexities of the situation have been distorted and confused almost beyond recognition by an uncontrolled and seemingly uncontrollable force in our national life known as public diplomacy. This phenomenon has all but usurped the Senate's advise and consent role in the field of foreign affairs.

Many of those who oppose our policy in Vietnam are articulate, emotionally compulsive and highly vocal. Most of them are politically motivated. Collectively, they have established themselves as the self-anointed priesthood of the new profession of public diplomacy.

Numerically the various pressure-groups comprising the public diplomacy network are insignificant. But their ability to confuse the public mind on the crucial issues involved in Vietnam is great.

Indeed, the cumulative impact of the raging torrent of contradictory publicity has produced dismay and bewilderment among many of our most distinguished and experienced analysts of international affairs. They have called on the Congress—and particularly the Sen-

ate—for clarification. I mention a few recent examples.

Walter Lippmann thinks that what is needed is a "thorough debate" in the Senate of what he calls the "surreptitious war" in Vietnam.

James Reston believes that the Senate has failed to discuss the issue in Vietnam with any perception. In a column entitled "What Great Debate?"—New York Times, January 21, 1966—he complains:

If all this is to confuse the enemy, it must be a success—for the so-called debate is certainly confusing everybody else.

Eric Sevareid, in a remarkably perceptive column, says we have reached "a watershed in our history which will require the understanding of this and many Congresses to come." That Vietnam is merely the shock which "completes the process of dissolving the American illusions."

Has this distinguished body indeed been derelict in its duties and responsibilities?

Tom Wicker—Washington correspondent of the New York Times, in a column on "The Role of Congress in the 20th Century" written as far back as August of 1965—notes that the Senate has all but abandoned its traditional role as the watchdog of our foreign policy.

He urged that great foreign policy issues should be the subject of Senate discussion—not only this year but in the years to come—as a vital constitutional responsibility. These are his words:

What Congress ought to develop is effective means of shaping and influencing Presidential power, directing it to new concerns * * * nitpicking at executive prerogatives is no substitute for a vital representative function.

Let me repeat.

Now is the time for the Senate, in the discharge of its constitutional responsibility, to help build the informed national resolve which must be the lifeline of our national purpose in Vietnam.

Surely, this Chamber dare not abdicate its advise and consent responsibility to the vicissitudes of electronic public diplomacy. Nor to sacrifice what the late President Kennedy called our greatest asset. I quote:

The willingness of a free and determined people, through their elected officials, to face all problems and meet all dangers free from panic and fear.

Let us, then, discuss in this Chamber the painful and momentous subject of Vietnam. In all humility, I suggest a few caveats.

Let our discussion be free of the ideological clichés and stereotypes which are endemic to the practice of public diplomacy as I have described it.

Let us remember that it is not the mission of the Senate to second guess or outguess the President in his day-to-day foreign policymaking.

Let us bear in mind that, unlike the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Senate is poorly equipped to coach the Commander in Chief on the abatement or stepping-up

February 18, 1966

of the bombing of strategic targets in Vietnam.

Let us be cautious in expressing geopolitical judgments or strategic opinions as to whether or not any proposed or even rumored military action will embroil us in a nuclear exchange with Russia; or in a protracted landwar with mainland China.

Let us not be stampeded, one way or another, by claim as to whether world opinion will or will not approve the President's course in Vietnam. As former Secretary of State Dean Acheson said:

Any country half slave or all slave to foreign criticism cannot stand except as a mental institution.

Let us not forget the symbolic importance of foreign policy, particularly in Western dealings with the Communist world.

Let us not forget that in our dealings with this Communist adversary the thrust of his aggression will invariably be directed at the weak points of our psychological armor.

Finally, let us never forget that a power—even as great a power as the United States—can survive only if it is willing to fight for its interpretation of justice and its conception of vital interest.

The issues which will come up for discussion are many. Some of them of so delicate a nature that they can be considered only in executive session.

But what the American people will expect to get from their Senate are informed and honest answers to two overriding questions:

Just what are our country's stakes in Vietnam?

And are they worth fighting for?

THE INTELLIGENT MANAGEMENT OF RISK

There are no easy answers to these questions. And any responsible answers will involve value judgments on which reasonable men may honestly differ. But what we must remember is that we face a condition, not a theory. We are heavily involved in southeast Asia.

Nor can we forget that as the lynchpin of free world security and stability, the United States cannot avoid risk in the conduct of its foreign affairs. Its objective must be the intelligent management of risk. Accordingly, the potential risks which, it is claimed our present course involves—such as the danger of a war with Red China—should be coolly assessed and balanced against the hazards entailed in any alternative which the critics of our present course propose.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently heard the views of Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, now retired, and former Ambassador George F. Kennan, two distinguished critics of our Vietnam policy. Now, I have great respect for both General Gavin and Mr. Kennan. Indeed it was in February of 1946—during my tour of duty as Assistant Secretary of State—that George Kennan, then our Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow, cabled the Department the original version of his now celebrated and widely published analysis of Soviet behavior.

In their televised testimony before the committee, both General Gavin and Ambassador Kennan agreed they had nothing but praise for the military performance of our commanders and troops in Vietnam. But they insisted that escalation of the conflict might involve us in a war with Red China.

General Gavin was of the opinion that a substantial American troop buildup beyond present levels might provoke Chinese intervention in Vietnam. Ambassador Kennan stated that such intervention "almost certainly" would occur if we were "to attempt to crush North Vietnam strength to a point where Hanoi could no longer give any support to Vietcong political activity in the south."

While the possibility of such intervention by Peiping should not be ignored, the risk must be calculated on the basis of probabilities. It is one which only the President is in a position to evaluate and manage in the light of indispensable secret intelligence and the counsel of his responsible military and political advisers.

General Gavin made it clear that since his retirement from the Army in 1958 he has had no access to classified military information. Ambassador Kennan made a similar disclaimer, adding that he had no specialized knowledge of southeast Asia.

The nub of the testimony of both men is this. Our stakes in Vietnam do not justify the costs of the conflict or the risk of war with China which they believe it might provoke. Indeed Ambassador Kennan feels that our involvement is one our Government should liquidate "just as soon as this can be done without inordinate damage to our own prestige or to the stability of conditions in that area."

If our stakes in Vietnam were as negligible as General Gavin and Ambassador Kennan apparently believe them to be, our position there would have been liquidated long ago. But are they negligible? And can they be liquidated without "inordinate damage to our prestige" and to our international position? Here we come face to face with the question I posed originally, which the Gavin-Kennan testimony largely ignores and which the administration has discussed mainly in generalities.

Just what are our country's stakes in Vietnam?

OUR STAKES IN VIETNAM

As I see them, our stakes in Vietnam are political, moral, psychological, and military. In that order. I believe they are mountain high.

OUR SYSTEM OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY

At the end of World War II we were prepared to entrust our national survival to a system of collective security under the Security Council of the United Nations. When that failed, we sought to salvage the system through a network of regional alliances of mutual defense under the United Nations Charter.

Thus we have the Inter-American Treaty for the Western Hemisphere, NATO for Europe, the Baghdad Pact for the Middle East, SEATO for southeast

Asia and ANZUS for Australia and New Zealand. In addition to these multilateral pacts, we have bilateral mutual defense treaties with Japan, Nationalist China, South Korea, and the Philippines.

The fundamental purpose of these treaties is to keep our allies from falling under Communist influence or domination. For, should that ever occur, the scales of world power would be tipped against the free world.

The primary function of these pacts is to draw a line across which an aggressor cannot move without risk of war and, should aggression occur, to legitimize U.S. intervention.

But without the ability, willingness, and determination of the United States to use its power to carry out its treaty obligations, these mutual defense pacts are mere scraps of paper.

This is why Communist politico-military strategy presses a never-ending effort to diminish American power and influence on the Eurasian Continent and in the Western Hemisphere.

What would happen if the United States failed to redeem its pledge under the SEATO Treaty to defend the independence of South Vietnam. A chain reaction—even now foreseeable would be triggered.

The confidence of the free people of Asia in the value of the U.S. commitment to deter Communist aggression would be undermined. They would rush to make their pathetic deals with one or the other of the two great Communist powers of Asia.

The long shadow of impending catastrophe would lengthen. For South Vietnam would provide the blueprint for the takeover of Latin America and Africa by a variety of indigenous Ho Chi Minhs.

Our influence in the world—the influence of the great power that is the United States—would be bankrupt.

Penned up in the Western Hemisphere, with our foreign markets and supplies of essential raw materials dependent on the mercy of the Communists, our full-employment economy would be shattered.

The alternatives would be grim. National pacifism combined with unilateral disarmament. Or isolationism in fortress America—beleaguered in a Communist world.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yesterday the Committee on Foreign Relations was privileged to hear Gen. Maxwell Taylor testify. Gen. Maxwell Taylor was the commander of the 101st Airborne Division that dropped in by parachute on Normandy several hours before the first boat hit the beach on D-day in France. He is perhaps the greatest fighting officer still alive in this country. General Taylor's son is at present serving as a captain of infantry.

General Taylor testified that that same old division, the 101st Airborne, today is composed of boys who are just as good as those who dropped in on the Germans in Normandy on D-day. He testified that

February 18, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

the boys in the 1st Marines are just as good as the boys who served in that division in earlier years. The same is true of the 25th Division. The same is true of all the other fine units in Vietnam. The same is true of the qualifications of the fine Special Service Forces. Their morale is magnificent.

I checked the records of the 1st Infantry, which marched behind George Washington. I checked the records of all the units. Not one of them has ever been defeated by the enemy on a field of battle.

General Taylor said, in effect, that if this Nation suffers defeat and national dishonor, and if these fine young men are compelled to pull Old Glory down from the flagpole and run up the white flag of surrender, it will not be because they did not fight; it will be because we did not let them fight and because we failed to support them. If they are defeated, defeat will have resulted from orders from Washington, from erroneous instructions from Congress. But they will not be defeated because they failed to fight for their country.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. It will be because we lacked moral stature and fiber here.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They will be defeated because we were not made of the stern stuff that characterized the men who sat in the Senate in years gone by. They will not be defeated because they were not worthy of their fathers or grandfathers.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. It will not be because the junior Senator from Louisiana has not stood up for them. I commend the Senator. He has stood fast in support of our fighting men in Vietnam and of our policy there. He is one of the strong voices in the Senate on this subject. I commend him for that. The American people have gratitude to him for it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I deeply appreciate the fine statement that the Senator from South Carolina is making.

If I had been asked whether we should send men over there, I do not know what I would have advised. Probably I would have advised against sending them. But if I had been shown the treaty we had made and had been aware of the sacrifices being made by the people of Vietnam in trying to defend their liberty against communism, I might have been persuaded that we should send our men there.

But if I had agreed to send them, I would have said, "Please send our boys who are there all the things that they need to fight with. If they are likely to be cut off and might have to surrender, send reinforcements. Do not send them there to surrender and be decimated with no help coming, as happened at the time of Dienbienphu."

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. I certainly agree with the Senator from Louisiana.

NATIONAL HONOR AND NATIONAL PURPOSE

The Geneva agreement of 1962 to which we were signatory was supposed to guarantee the neutrality of Laos. We signed in good faith. It was immedi-

ately violated by the Communists. Laos became a corridor for the conquest of South Vietnam. Today, among the nations of southeast Asia, Geneva has already become a symbol of American lack of power to deter Communist aggression. Or worse—the lack of our Nation's will to use its military power in the discharge of its national commitments.

When we signed the agreement to insure the neutrality of Laos we had not begun the conversion of our military posture from one of nuclear massive retaliation to the present one of flexible response. In South Vietnam we can now be flexible and firm.

We must be firm in our resolve to fight until a self-enforcing, subversion-proof settlement which secures the independence of South Vietnam is reached. A settlement which will eliminate the Vietcong as an internal force for the Communist conquest of South Vietnam by terror, assassination, and subversion.

This is the only kind of settlement which can justify the sacrifice of American lives in Vietnam. But let us be realistic. Such a settlement is a vain hope within the framework of the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962.

But if we fail to achieve such a settlement, all our sacrifices in Vietnam will have been in vain. Peiping's hard line communism will have proved to the world its paper tiger theory of American power.

THE SYMBOLIC VALUE OF SOUTH VIETNAM

In the world of Communist propaganda, where symbols are all important, we have an enormous stake in South Vietnam.

If we stand fast in our purpose, we can make South Vietnam a sanctuary of freedom. Saigon can become to Asia what West Berlin is to Europe—a living symbol of American resolve in the defense of human liberty.

We cannot permit a situation which would make it possible for the Communists to propagandize South Vietnam throughout the world as the living symbol of the political and military defeat of America in Asia. Dienbienphu has been immortalized by Communist propaganda as the living symbol of the total liquidation of decadent French colonialism in southeast Asia.

Peiping's great stake in South Vietnam is not its rice or its real estate. The real target is psychological—the dramatic and enduring humiliation of the United States as a significant influence on the continent of Asia.

Should this occur, our heavy investment in a policy of cooperation with Russia will be lost. For the easy success of Peiping's hard-line communism against the United States will make it extremely difficult for the Soviet leadership to continue its present moderate policy of peaceful coexistence with the free world. Our lack of a firm national purpose will have united the two great Communist powers in a common and frightening design for world conquest.

THE CREDIBILITY OF OUR MILITARY DETERRENT

It is not enough to stand and fight for our stakes in South Vietnam. The

way in which we do it is of enormous military, political, and psychological import. For this is the heyday of the cheapest form of Communist conquest—the so-called civil wars of national liberation externally controlled.

The late President Kennedy told the Congress 5 years ago that, since 1945, limited or guerrilla wars of purported national liberation constituted "the most active and constant threat to free world security."

At that time he declared to the world at large that our response to such aggression in the future would be "suitable, selective, swift, and determined." But an undeclared limited war in which the objective is not the defeat of the adversary, is difficult for the American people to understand. They believe that, as Gen. Douglas MacArthur put it:

In war there is no substitute for victory.

The fact that there has been no declaration of war by the Congress has inclined many people to doubt the serious nature of the war.

The President's zealous efforts to reach an honorable settlement in Vietnam have been interpreted as a sign of weakness by the enemy and by many Americans. I urge we make it clear that there is no uncertainty now, either as to our national determination or our military capability.

The aggression must be liquidated. It must be dealt with in a way that will effectively deter any future aggressions of similar character.

We have the physical power to do exactly that. But our adversaries are the acknowledged masters of the political and psychological weapons of protracted guerrilla warfare.

They know we have the power. But they are confident that we do not have the national will to use it.

As Hanoi's famous strategist Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap put it:

The enemy [the United States] will be caught in a dilemma. He has to drag out the war in order to win it and does not possess, on the other hand, the psychological and political means to fight a long drawn out war.

For the United States, Vietnam is the moment of truth. We have now had 5 years of intensive experience in southeast Asia, with the most subtle form of Communist aggression. If we prove our ability to deal with it in Vietnam, we will deter the spread of this menace to other areas where we are committed to resist it.

In my humble opinion, we must establish in Vietnam—for the years to come—a credible deterrent to Communist wars of liberation of the Vietnam type.

This means that our capability to deter such Communist aggression by appropriate military doctrine and weapons systems and our national will to use that capability must be believable and believed by the aggressors.

Our vast stockpile of international ballistic missiles with nuclear war heads is no deterrent to guerrilla wars of national liberation. Defeating the purposes of such a war in Vietnam will establish a truly credible deterrent.

CONCLUSION

I profoundly believe that our stakes in Vietnam involve not our interpretation of justice, but also our conception of the vital interests of the United States. These stakes are, in my judgment, worth fighting for.

The conduct of foreign policy under conditions of limited war is not an exact science. The contribution of expertise is limited. After the "objective analysis and research of a situation" is complete, there still remains uncertainty about the meaning of events and the balancing of the risks which they entail and the opportunities they offer.

But there is no certainty. Conjecture to some extent is unavoidable. Yet in foreign policy—as our Communist adversaries should have taught us by now—certainty comes as much from political philosophy and insight as it does from computerized facts. Above all, it derives from the imposition of purpose on events.

Tested by these criteria, the President's course in Vietnam has been admirable and presents the Congress with a unique opportunity for moral leadership. By moral leadership I mean an affirmation of the shared values that make America a society rather than a population or a bewildered crowd.

The kind of leadership I have in mind was defined by our distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, when he was President of the Carnegie Corp. Mr. Gardner said:

Leaders worthy of the name whether they are university presidents or Senators have a significant role in creating the state of mind that is the society. They can serve as symbols of the moral unity of the society. They can express the values that hold the society together.

I respectfully submit that we in the Senate bear a heavy responsibility at this critical time for demonstrating to the world at large that we share the values which our fighting men are asked to defend on the field of battle.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS TO 1:30 P.M.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, under the present circumstances, with no speaker readily available, it would occur to me to be the better part of wisdom that the Senate take a brief recess; and if it is in order, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 1:30 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 1:30 o'clock p.m. the same day.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BASS in the chair).

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask that the business coming over from the previous day may be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business has already been laid down.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It has been. I merely wish to express the hope that we may reach a determination somewhere along the line on this authorization. I am not fundamentally opposed to filibusters if they have a definite objective. As a matter of fact, I have been accused of participating in them myself on one or more occasions. I might say on more than one occasion. But as a rule, a filibuster has some objective.

In this case I cannot see what the objective can possibly be. After the authorization is passed here, it must go to the House of Representatives and be passed before the appropriation can be made to fulfill the purposes of this authorization.

We now have some 300,000 members of our Armed Forces in Vietnam or in the lands or on the waters about that strife-torn land.

There have been extensive committee hearings and I have no objection to that. If Senators wish to have televised hearings that go into the living rooms of their constituencies, and if they wish to ask long, complicated questions, I understand that thoroughly. I have been around here a good while. I understand those things. There is nothing mysterious about them to me.

But I would like at least to have some alternative to our present policy brought forward from these hearings. If members of the committee wish to bring an alternative forward, they will have ample opportunity to do so, because the House Appropriations Committee will not act on the appropriations bill until this authorization bill is enacted; and when the appropriation does come from the House, by that time even the most determined critic of our present policy should have his alternative ready.

The only one I have heard mentioned up to now is a proposal by one Member of the Senate that we just get out of Vietnam; that we just call the whole thing off and come home, and leave South Vietnam to the Communists. That is the only real alternative I have heard suggested.

If the objectors will just get their alternatives ready and bring them to the Senate, the Senate can consider them.

But as it is, they are only holding up consideration of this authorization, without which appropriations cannot possibly be made.

It seems to me, that after a reasonable period there should be some alternative proposed. I know the committee has examined witnesses. It has heard General Taylor and General Gavin and Ambassador Kennan, and I understand the Secretary of State is there today. The members have engaged in a great verbal debate with these witnesses who, of course, are among the most outstanding men in their fields. But they have not brought forward their alternatives.

I say, Mr. President, that it is not proper to hold up a mere authorization for appropriation unless there is going to be some alternative proposed.

So I say to these gentlemen: Let us vote on this authorization. If Senators wish to vote against it, vote against it. But if Senators continue this delay interminably, we risk losing the war in Vietnam by a process of attrition and a lack of ammunition which our forces must have to defend themselves.

I submit, Mr. President, it would be a sorry spectacle for a country as wealthy as ours, and as powerful as ours, to lose a war for any such reason. I hope we may at least proceed to vote on this authorization bill. We have had a number of speeches on both sides of it. I do not know of a single citizen of the United States who is happy about our being engaged in this war in southeast Asia, but the stern, undeniable fact is that we are there and there are 300,000 American boys in that tortured land, or on the waters around it, or the lands adjacent to it.

If we do not propose to authorize food, clothing, and hospitals for them, we should let it be known now by voting down this authorization and giving the Defense Department a chance to bring our forces home, even though that would be like coming home as a whipped puppy with its tail between its legs. It is not fair to these men. They did not order themselves out there. They are there on orders from higher authority.

As long as they are there, I think it is the duty of the Senate of the United States to maintain them without regard to what the views individual Senators may be on the policies involved and on the international ramifications of the entire southeast Asian question.

I, therefore, hope we will not, by the subterfuge of filibustering this authorization, seek to bring our Vietnam effort to a close by abandonment.

If there are those who wish to bring it to a close by not feeding, and clothing, and arming the men, let them stand up on this floor and vote this resolution down and defeat it.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in the light of what the Senator from Georgia, the distinguished manager of the bill now before us said, I wish to make it perfectly clear, speaking just as one Member of the Senate who has had some questions from time to time about our policy in southeast Asia, that I do not believe any filibuster has taken place

February 18, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3303

or that anyone, to my knowledge, intends a filibuster on this bill.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Was the Senator here the day the bill was made the unfinished business and the statement was made that there would be no agreement to vote this week on this bill in any event? If that does not bear the earmarks of a filibuster, I do not know what does. It indicates an intention to delay. That, in the last analysis, is what a filibuster is. They did not say when everybody made a speech; they said, "We want to serve notice there is not going to be any vote." If that is not a filibuster or the threat of a filibuster, then I, who have been accused of filibustering a great deal, and might plead guilty in certain instances, do not know what a filibuster is.

Mr. McGOVERN. I cannot speak for the Senators that the Senator from Georgia is referring to. I can speak only for myself.

But I think a few days' discussion of an authorization of nearly \$5 billion should not quite so quickly be labeled a "filibuster."

We have just completed a discussion of some weeks' duration on the question of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which is doubtless an important issue, but which I know the Senator from Georgia would agree is not any more important and probably not so significant as the conflict in which we are involved in southeast Asia.

This would seem to be an appropriate time to raise some questions about where we are headed. For my own part, I intend to vote for every bit of the authorization in the bill before the Senate. I have never felt that the financial cost of the war was the issue. I do believe there are some serious questions that we probably should have asked, even at an earlier date, about the assumption that sent our troops to Vietnam in the first place.

But I quite agree with the Senator from Georgia that our forces are committed and, therefore, must be adequately equipped. I was in Vietnam and visited some of them in November and December. They are the finest group of military men we have ever sent overseas. There is no question in my mind about their competence, their dedication, and their capacity. In every sense of the word, they are a superb group of men, and I personally want to see them have all the equipment they need for the defense of their lives.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. If the men we have sent to Vietnam are not soldiers, the United States of America does not have any soldiers. They are the cream of the crop.

Mr. McGOVERN. I wholly agree with that statement. The Senator is absolutely correct. This country has perhaps never before assembled quite so superb

a group of men as those we now have fighting in southeast Asia. I feel certain that every Member of the Senate shares the conviction of the Senator from Georgia that we need to do everything we can to see to it that they are adequately equipped and provided with the resources they need to fulfill the mission to which they have been assigned.

Having said that, I also believe it is perfectly proper for us to have had several days of discussion on this subject, and perhaps some additional time, to examine the question of what our commitment is in Vietnam; to what extent the bill now before the Senate might commit us to some new ventures in that part of the world; and to make certain that we know where the course we are now on is leading.

I am one of a group of Senators who thought seriously of submitting an amendment to this authorization bill that would in some way try to limit the impact of the bill to sustaining the forces already in being in Vietnam, but also in some fashion to reflect the opposition or at least the concern of a number of Members of the Senate about the dangers of any larger war in Vietnam.

I personally hold to the conviction that the late President Kennedy expressed in 1963 that we should not make this an American war. He said he felt it was perfectly proper for us to send aid to the people of South Vietnam; that he thought it was perfectly proper for us to give them the benefit of our best military advice and some limited amount of assistance; but that in the last analysis only the people of South Vietnam, their Government, and their military forces could decide the outcome of the war.

So there was a feeling on the part of a number of Senators that perhaps the particular bill now before the Senate might be a good vehicle to express our conviction that we have reached the point where we need to consider whether to extend the commitment of American forces beyond their present level. At the time the late President Kennedy implied that we should not commit further American troops to Vietnam, we had about 15,000 or 20,000 men there. We now have something over 200,000 men in Vietnam, and another 75,000 to 100,000 in Naval units offshore and in nearby areas.

I have felt that the reason why some Senators are disturbed about this authorization bill or about the course we are on in Vietnam is that each time our policy planners have told us that such-and-such a commitment would be enough to do the job, they have been proved wrong. We were told some years ago that the strategic hamlet program was the answer to the problem. A considerable amount of money was invested in that program, but it proved to be a disastrous failure. We were told that limited bombing attacks would bring the other side to the negotiating table, or at least would interrupt the flow of troops moving into South Vietnam from the north. Instead, it is reported that nine regiments of North Vietnamese regulars

have come into the fighting during the time the bombing attacks were in progress.

The same kind of predictions have been made about the commitments of American forces on the ground. It has been said that if we committed X number of American men to the conflict, they would be enough to do the job. But always the predictions have been wrong.

Personally, I have much more confidence in the judgment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] than I do in the judgment of some of the policymakers in the Department of Defense and the Department of State, who have been calling for more and more commitments of American forces.

So I believe the Senate is acting within its best traditions and within its area of responsibility when it takes a few days to raise some questions about the course we are following in Vietnam. I hope a filibuster will not develop. I certainly do not intend to participate in anything that I think could properly be described as a filibuster on this measure. I do intend to continue to raise questions, so long as those questions are in my mind and in the minds of my constituents, about the commitments we have made in Vietnam.

I commend the Senator from Georgia for the very clear assurance that he gave us in his excellent presentation of the bill when it was first laid before the Senate. He said:

Nothing in this legislation can properly be considered as determining foreign policy, as ratifying decisions made in the past or as endorsing new commitments.

It was because the distinguished Senator from Georgia gave that kind of assurance on the floor of the Senate that I, at least, decided that no rider or no amendment was necessary to limit the scope of the proposed legislation.

The Senator from Georgia has made it perfectly clear that we are not making any policy declarations or declarations of support for the decisions that have been made in the past 12 years, which have involved us in Vietnam. I know that the Senator from Georgia has had some serious questions about some of our past commitments. He has made it perfectly clear that we are not committing ourselves to or are not endorsing any new ventures either in South Vietnam or anywhere else in southeast Asia, but that all we are doing by the bill is to provide the necessary authorization, and subsequently appropriation, to take care of the needs of the troops that have been sent there and whose lives are at stake.

With that purpose I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Georgia. I wish to make it clear that it is on that basis that I personally see no need for any further amendments or qualifications on the authorization bill.

I did not intend to speak on the subject of Vietnam today. We have some serious problems to deal with at home. One of them is the problem of the agricultural sectors of the country. There is no more acute problem in that sector than the problem of our dairy farmers.

Before I offer my remarks on that subject, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I was pleased, and I know many other Senators were, by the message from the President which stated that the Secretary of Agriculture was being directed to buy dairy products under section 709 of the Agricultural Act of 1965—the section which I was privileged to sponsor as an amendment to the very important farm bill that was passed by Congress last year.

I was delighted that the message stressed the need for adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets and also for the high priority demands of our feeding programs here at home and overseas.

The message stated that milk from American farmers is the only milk available to millions of poor children abroad.

Mr. President, we are now participating in overseas child-feeding programs that reach almost 50 million children through school lunch programs of one kind or another. The real backbone of those programs is the milk supply that we send abroad.

To many of these youngsters, it is the only adequate meal they received during the day. Of course, the same thing is true, although perhaps not to quite as acute a degree, in our own milk programs at home, which contribute so much to the health and strength of our own children.

If we are to fulfill the aspirations of the President, to say nothing of commercial market requirements, it is essential that the national dairy herd be maintained and that our farmers have adequate encouragement to supply the necessary quantities of milk for all purposes—for commercial purposes as well as for our feeding program.

I believe every Senator is fully aware that milk prices to farmers are supported by the Agricultural Act of 1949, and that for several years the rate of price support has been either at the minimum or near the minimum required by law.

As a result of price support levels being too low, dairy herds are now being liquidated by many farmers, just at the time when more milk, not less, is needed for the commercial market and for distribution programs here at home and abroad.

One such program which is of interest to most of us concerns special milk for children on which program the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] has done so much work. We cannot let this program lapse by default. We must provide sufficient money for the program and then see that

there is a supply of milk to meet the needs of our children.

Mr. President, I believe that no other program has resulted in greater dividends in terms of health and the strength of children for so little cost as has this special milk program.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I believe my colleague has brought to the attention of the Senate the very genuine problem that confronts initially the milk producers of the United States and, in the final analysis, confronts even more seriously the general public and the schoolchildren of America.

I certainly associate myself with his statement that it was a disastrous bit of news for schoolchildren and for their parents around the country when the President's Bureau of the Budget recommended a 79-percent cut in the money available for the school milk program.

On the Appropriations Committee on which I serve, and on which serves also the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to whom my colleague has just alluded, I recall the very fervid, effective, and persuasive pleas the Senator makes every year for an increase over the recommendations which come down from the White House and the Bureau of the Budget.

We felt rather proud of the fact that we did provide \$103 million in the budget for the current fiscal year. However, we are now confronted with the President's proposed reduction of 79 percent for next year and also a reclaimer of \$3 million of the amount of money which was added largely because of the persistence and insistence and persuasiveness, fortified with facts as he was, of the Senator from Wisconsin.

I am glad that my colleague points out also that this attack on the school milk program is just one facet of the overall program. We need greater production of milk and larger dairy herds, and the way to get that is to increase the price support made available to producers of milk.

I should like to address a question to my colleague, who serves as an important member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I am a reluctant alumnus. Is not my memory correct that this increase in price support can be provided expeditiously by action of the Secretary of Agriculture under prevailing legislation and will not require new legislation or the delay occasioned by new legislation?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator is correct. As he knows, as a senior member of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, and one who has been very actively involved on behalf of dairy farmers for a good many years, the Secretary does have such authority.

I have discussed this matter with the Secretary and with other officials at the Department of Agriculture. I am hopeful that we can arrange for a meeting with him of the Senators who are now on the floor and others who are interested in this problem, so we can sit down with

the Secretary and tell him about some of the problems our dairy farmers are having: the financial squeeze that faces a good many of them, the disappearance of some of our dairy herds, and the liquidation of those herds at a time when they are increasingly needed. I hope on the basis of such conversations we can persuade the Secretary to act very quickly, and use the authority that Congress has given him to lift the price support level. It does not really require any further action on the part of the Congress; that authority, as the Senator says, rests with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MUNDT. Does my colleague share my concern that with prevailing meat prices as high as they are, and the production of milk as unprofitable as it is, that unless some action is taken, we are likely to see a decrease in dairy herds, by drawing them off to the market, rather than maintaining even the status quo?

Mr. McGOVERN. There is no question about continued liquidation of dairy herds. The Senator is absolutely correct. We are all very grateful for the somewhat improved situation in cattle and hogs today; but that only further points up the need to do something about one of the forgotten men in American agriculture, the dairy farmer. What the Senator describes is happening. The farmers are liquidating their dairy herds and moving into other more profitable lines of production. They are doing it just at a time when the President has called upon Congress to authorize a mass attack upon hunger abroad, and to do even more than food for peace has heretofore been authorized to undertake. The President's food-for-freedom program, which I vigorously applaud, comes at a time when commercial demands on dairy farmers are increasing.

Mr. MUNDT. I have one comment, Mr. President, to which I shall not ask my colleague to reply. This astonishing request on the part of the President to reduce the school milk program by 79 percent causes me to have some curiosity about who is writing the speeches down at the White House. We hear of changes in speechwriters and the shortage of speechwriters, and so forth. I believe they have too many speechwriters down there. I do not believe the very fine speechwriter who helped the President with his state of the Union address, wherein he said we could have both guns and butter at the same time, and carry the war in Vietnam to a successful conclusion without sacrifices of other programs, who can tell us where economies can be made, is the same one who says to take it away from the homeless, the poverty stricken, the schoolchildren. This other speechwriter who talked about cutting back the milk program 79 percent must not be related to the fellow who helped the President with his state of the Union speech.

I challenge the administration here and now, Mr. President, to show any place else in the total existing program of the executive branch where there has been as sharp a cut proposed as the 79

well expressed on the Senate floor today concerning the proposed reductions contained in the fiscal year 1967 budget for the national school lunch and special milk programs. I am of the opinion, as are a majority of the Members of this body, that we must reduce nonessential Federal expenditures in view of our military commitments in southeast Asia. There are innumerable areas where the administration and Congress can cut back on financial outlays without jeopardizing the health of our children or in any way impeding the well-being of any of our citizens.

The school lunch program and the special milk program are, however, in my view very important and successful programs, and they deserve to be continued at least at the level of recent years.

I intend to vote and do all I can to restore the proposed cuts. The health and physical welfare of our school children is an essential matter, and the funds devoted to this cause should not be reduced while other much less essential programs continue in full force or are even increased.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I want to commend the junior Senator from South Dakota for his leadership and his fine presentation of our serious dairy problem and associate myself with him. In his recent message on food-for-freedom, President Johnson called for the Government purchase of limited amounts of dairy products under the new open market purchase authority in the Agricultural Act of 1965. The President said:

We must have adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets, and to meet the high priority domestic and foreign program needs. Milk from U.S. farms is the only milk available to millions of poor children abroad. The Secretary of Agriculture will use authority in the 1965 act whenever necessary to meet our needs for dairy products.

The need for dairy products comes pointedly at the time of a shrinking dairy industry. It comes at a time when surpluses have been curtailed and when supplies for commercial markets are decreasing. The high priority domestic and foreign program needs of which the President speaks are endangered by the downward trend in production.

The level of prices to farmers is discouraging to the continued production of milk. The primary dairy States are reporting cuts in production from a year ago as my colleagues have pointed out. It is my hope the Secretary of Agriculture will continue to review the support program for dairy products in light of what is required to stabilize dairy production on a firm basis and provide for milk we will need for fullest growth of both domestic and international needs.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] for their perceptive remarks and their contribution to this discussion.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAULTY CONSTRUCTION OF POST OFFICE BUILDINGS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, recently a situation came to my attention concerning the Post Office Department which caused me a great deal of concern.

I think the Senate and the public should be aware of the situation; therefore, I shall outline briefly a series of events involving the construction and leasing of certain post offices.

I should like to say at the outset that Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien performed an outstanding public service by taking immediate corrective action when I called this matter to his attention.

The matter to which I am referring involves the operations of an organization known as the Schur-Lee Realty Corp., Hackensack, N.J., whose principal officer is Mr. Aaron Schurman.

Mr. Schurman has been a principal in several different corporations which have obtained contracts to build and lease 12 U.S. post office buildings since 1958 in cities in the States of New Jersey, New York, and North Carolina.

The Schur-Lee Corp. has obtained contracts to build and lease 4 of the 12 post offices in North Carolina, in the cities of Goldsboro, Asheboro, Sanford, and Shelby.

An intolerable situation came to my attention when I learned that the city of Sanford had revoked the corporation's license to do business in that city when it was found that the construction of the foundation of the new post office in Sanford did not meet local building codes and was not in accordance with the specifications drawn by the Post Office Department.

On January 25, 1966, I sent a telegram concerning the matter to the Postmaster General, which is as follows:

In strongest possible terms I respectfully recommend immediate investigation of performance by contractor on post office building at Sanford, N.C., now under construction. Sanford municipal government has revoked contractor's license to operate in Sanford, and all work has been stopped. Complaints of most serious nature have repeatedly been made by responsible citizens and officials of Sanford in recent weeks, and I have repeatedly called them to attention of proper postal authorities who made it clear they share my concern, but seem to be hampered by legal considerations relating to contractual relationship between the contractor and the Government. Similar problems arose when same contractor was working on Asheboro post office project. Understand he was low bidder on several other North Carolina post office projects. I believe in being fair and there may be extenuating circumstances about which I do not know, but it appears to me that there is urgent need for prompt action to correct an intolerable situation.

Upon receiving the telegram the Postmaster General took immediate steps to have a complete investigation made. The Postmaster General informed me on February 14, 1966, that the contract between the Post Office Department and the Schur-Lee Realty Corp. for the Sanford post office building had been canceled.

Furthermore, the Postmaster General has assured me that his Department is continuing its investigation of all of the contracts it has in the 12 cities in New Jersey, New York, and North Carolina, to determine if any other defaults have occurred.

I have a file of information on what has occurred in connection with the proposed post office building in Sanford, and I have passed on all of the information I have obtained to the Postmaster General.

Of course, I am not familiar with all of the details of the contracts in the 11 other cities, but what happened in Sanford is a good example of a private corporation trying to get by with shoddy construction and a completely unacceptable building to house a post office.

There are strong indications that this same corporation has made a practice of trying to give the Government the run-around in meeting its contractual obligations through delay and slowness in correcting sloppy work.

I hope that the Post Office Department, as a result of the experience it has had with the Schur-Lee Corp., will make a broad review of all of the construction-lease agreements it has made. There is an urgent need to find out if other attempts are being made to do what was done in Sanford before it was corrected.

The private contractors who lease facilities to the Post Office Department are paid, and they are paid well, for their services. In turn they should be required not only to provide facilities of superior quality, but to keep them serviced and in first-class condition without delays and constant prodding. We cannot tolerate anything less, and we will not tolerate anything less.

I think it would also be proper for the Post Office Department, in reviewing its contract-lease agreements, to give serious study to this method of building postal facilities, and I hope that the Postmaster General will recommend to Congress any changes in the existing contract-lease procedure that he feels will bring better postal service to the public.

UN THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, half a decade or so ago a great leader in the U.S. Senate wrote:

I am a free man, an American, a U.S. Senator, and a Democrat in that order.

I am also a liberal, a conservative, a Texan, a taxpayer, a rancher, a businessman, a consumer, a parent, a voter, not as young as I used to be nor as old as I expect to be. And I am all these things in no fixed order.

I am unaware of any descriptive word in the second paragraph which qualifies, modifies, amends or is related by hyphenation to the first paragraph. In consequence, I am not able—not even the least interested in trying—to define my political philosophy by

plants which make butter and nonfat dry milk are in grave danger of being closed.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Apropos of what the Senator has said, in my own home county, we have had two creameries for 25 or 30 years, affiliated with the Land-O-Lakes' Creamery organization, probably the best run operation in the United States. One of them was closed down about 3 months ago. It will never be opened again. This is a good example of how the dairy industry is being liquidated. Something has to be done to correct this.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator. These plants are being liquidated not only because of a lack of milk supplies but because they have tried to maintain prices to farmers that are beyond their capabilities.

A great number of them are paying prices to farmers that are not adequately provided for by the price support structure. Many of the plants—in fact, most of them in my State—are cooperatively owned by the farmers themselves. So they have a great stake in the industry. They have a stake in it both as farmers and operators of these cooperatively owned plants. But they cannot continue to pay themselves money that they cannot collect when they sell their products as nonfat dry milk to the Government.

The present price support level is \$3.24 per hundredweight. The Government pays prices for products used in its distribution programs which are geared to that support level.

Many of the manufacturing plants, hoping against hope for improvement in the market, have been paying their member producers substantially more than the \$3.24 level. But unless the market itself is corrected through adjustment of the price support level, many of these plants will be forced to close and the employees dismissed. That would have an adverse impact on rural America, and would obviously be totally inconsistent with the economic opportunity programs approved by the Congress at the request of the administration.

The problems of the dairy industry which I have been discussing have been visible ahead for some time. It was for this reason that I introduced legislation authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to go into the open market and purchase dairy products for distribution here at home and for programs we are operating abroad at market prices.

The new authority can be helpful, but the status of the industry has now declined to the point where an adjustment in the price support level is the only way to adjust dairy returns properly enough to assure an adequate supply of dairy products.

While the dairy industry is shrinking at an alarming rate, and the needs for dairy products are greater in overseas and domestic programs, the needs of the commercial market are growing as well.

The population of this country continues to increase. It was something over 195 million at the beginning of this year. The Nation is growing at a rate of 3 million people a year, or a market for milk and dairy products equivalent to a new city the size of Los Angeles.

If our growing population is to be fed, we must have steadily increased milk production to match the growth.

We all know the results when we come up too late with too little. I hope the Secretary of Agriculture will act now. If he does, I know he will have the support of the American people and of the Congress.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from South Dakota for his very thoughtful speech, and I wish to commend my senior colleague [Mr. PROXMIER] for his contribution on the dialog about this very serious matter involving our dairy farmers.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the revamped food-for-peace program proposed by the administration stresses the need for adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets and to meet high priority domestic and foreign program needs.

I am concerned, however, that this need for adequate supplies may not be reflected in prices to dairy farmers that will assure it.

If present inadequate price levels continue in the important north central dairy States, for example, it is certain that this important area will not be able to provide these needed supplies. The reserve supplies that have been available in this area in the past are disappearing and may no longer be available to fluid milk markets.

This milk shortage already is a serious problem for the important manufacturing sector of the dairy industry in these States. This industry, built around the making of cheese, butter and nonfat dry milk, already is having difficulty obtaining sufficient milk to keep plants running efficiently.

The answer, of course, is higher price supports. These higher prices are needed both to provide adequate income for farmers committed to staying in dairying and as a vote of confidence for those who are wavering.

Even without the anticipated stepping up of foreign demands for dairy products—both in food aid and commercial sales—the need for ample domestic production is growing.

The fluid milk and cream report, issued yesterday by the Department of Agriculture, shows the extent of these consumption changes in State and Federal milk marketing areas.

Whole milk sales in November were up 4 percent from a year earlier in these areas. Skim milk sales were up 12 percent from November a year earlier. Fluid cream sales were up 2 percent.

To summarize, total fluid sales in November in 76 marketing areas were up 6 percent from the same month in 1964. Yet the milk receipts from milk producers have been going down.

One indication of the economic problems in this area is the sharp drop in the number of producers in some of these State and Federal marketing areas. In 3 Illinois areas, for example, the number is down in 1 year from 18,186 producers to 16,453. In 3 Michigan areas, 13,887 down to 12,911. In 3 Wisconsin areas 4,197 to 4,137. In 2 Minnesota areas, 4,102 to 3,971. This drastic reduction in producers is the direct result of low prices. Many of our finest dairy farmers are being literally driven from the farm.

Two other related indicators reported by the Department of Agriculture are average daily receipts of milk from producers in these State and Federal milk marketing areas and average daily receipts per producer. Both show sharp drops in nearly all the midwest dairy States, undoubtedly reflecting discontent with milk prices.

Average daily receipts from two Minnesota areas are down from 3,417 million pounds in December of 1964 to 3,133 million pounds in the same month in 1965; five Iowa areas down from 3,317 million to 3,015 million; two South Dakota areas down from 622 million to 581 million; three Wisconsin areas down from 4,509 million to 4,324 million, and two Illinois areas down from 17,524 million to 14,893 million.

Sharp drops in average daily receipts per producer are shown in the current reports for these same States. These reductions reflect culling of dairy herds, poor quality feed due to drought and early frost, and unwillingness to buy feed concentrates that will not pay out at present dairy prices.

The Government now supports dairy products at 75 percent of parity or \$3.24 a hundred for milk going into manufacturing uses. This price has led to fewer cows being milked and fewer farmers remaining in dairying.

The incentive simply is not there at this price, especially for younger farmers who have the option of switching to feeding cattle or raising hogs, or some other type of farming. It has led to the alarming situation in Wisconsin in which it now is estimated that an average of 12 farmers a day stopped dairying in 1965.

The Secretary has reported that he is considering the many requests for raising support prices for the coming marketing year. My request is among them. I hope the alarming drop in milk production in the Midwest, which is without a doubt tied to the serious economic situation caused by continued low milk prices, will result in his setting dairy support prices at a realistic level without delay.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Wisconsin for the excellent statement he has just made on the dairy problem. Inasmuch as he comes from perhaps the greatest dairy State in the Union he knows this problem thoroughly. As the former Governor of that State he has been equally involved serving the dairy farmers for a good many years.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I share the concern which has been so

the choice of a one-word or two-word label. This may be against the tide, but, if so, the choice is deliberate.

The words are brilliant words of the man whom destiny and the American people have chosen as our leader in difficult days. They are the words of then-Senator Lyndon B. Johnson.

The beginning of an eloquent statement of political precepts, these words are the ones I borrow today to bring before the Senate some of my thoughts on the most vexing of this generation—Vietnam and the consequences of the war there, in the rest of southeast Asia, on the entire Asian Continent and, indeed, on the world.

There are those who would categorize Senators—indeed, all Americans—into neat pigeonholes marked “The Hawks” and “The Doves.” Or, even less appropriately, “those who support the President” and “those who oppose the President.”

As a Senator, Lyndon B. Johnson told us:

At the heart of my own beliefs is a rebellion against this very process, labeling and filing Americans under headings.

Mr. President, this is the position in which I find myself today. Indeed, I suspect many of us find ourselves today in this same position.

We are neither hawks nor doves. We desire to be neither.

We are pro-Americans, profreedom. We are anti-Communist, antislave.

We believe in meeting our commitments. We believe in peace with honor.

We know from a personal standpoint, many of us having served in the Armed Forces in wartime.

We are at once freemen, Americans, Senators, liberals, conservatives, businessmen, professional men, consumers, workers, parents, and voters. All of us are not as young as we used to be nor, hopefully, as old as we expect to be.

Yet, many are, as I am, the fathers of young sons who may be asked to march off to battle in a war that is undeclared and, indeed, not understood by the vast majority of Americans.

As we are loyal, sincere, and dedicated—that is, those of us in the Senate who feel this way—so are nearly all the 200 million Americans. They—and we—back our President. We applaud his patience and his perceptiveness. We applaud his efforts at peace, and, equally, his efforts to find a way to reconcile a belief in and a love of peace with the commitments to freedom and self-determination.

Yet, we have questions, questions that weigh heavily on the shoulders of our fighting men in Vietnam and their parents in Texas, in Indiana, and in all our 50 States.

In finding the answers to these questions—both those which are being asked and those which remain within others—I believe we must first come to certain factual conclusions.

First, Mr. President, there is the inescapable conclusion that America is today the single strongest Nation in the world, the strongest ever to grace the face of this globe in recorded history. This

very strength, capable of destruction of any combination of enemies, is capable of maintaining a peace—albeit in the twilight zone of a cold war or lukewarm war.

The fact that we can lick anyone is hardly disputed even by our adversaries and potential adversaries. Do we, therefore, unleash this awesome power and, thus, begin a nuclear war from which there will be no winner?

The answer is an obvious and clear “No.”

Therefore, we must conclude from this that we also oppose rightfully so-called preventative war, that we will refrain from dropping the bomb without provocation.

Second, I believe that nearly all thinking Americans recognize that we should not become involved in a land war against the mass of Asians.

Third, it is only rational to state that use of any nuclear device in this or any other conflict is merely a prelude to all-out nuclear war. There simply is no such thing as a limited nuclear conflict any more than there is anything like being partially pregnant.

These yardsticks must be applied, then, to the struggle in Vietnam.

It is my conviction—and that of many of my colleagues—that we are becoming embroiled in a land conflict on the continent of Asia whether we sought it, or desire it, or not.

I suggest that one reason that this is so is that the position of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has not been rotated in recent years. Rather, the Chairman has been an Army man.

I have no quarrel with the Army or with the able representatives it has given to the chairmanship—Lemnitz, Taylor, and Wheeler. Yet, these great leaders are, by their training, experience, and orientation, ground fighters.

I cannot help wondering whether an Air Force or a Navy Chairman would not today guide the Secretary of Defense and the President to a course different from that which we seem to be pursuing in the war.

A punishing, body-to-body confrontation in Asia lets the enemy decide how, when, and where we shall pit the forces of freedom against those of tyranny. It is in no way compatible with our clear superiority in nuclear strength, in air power, and in sea power.

In Vietnam we are not even fighting another Korea. A decade and a half ago our men fought in Korea side by side with Asians from Korea and from outside of Korea. We fought with European allies. We fought under the banner of the United Nations. And we fought with and beside the troops of a stable government—one so stable and so committed to freedom that her troops today are joined in the fight in Vietnam.

To be sure, there are today facts available in this country only to the President. To be sure, the ultimate decision of quo vadis—where to go—rests with our friend and leader, the President.

Yet, many of us would counsel him to beware of the hawks and the doves and,

above all, those who would neatly categorize all of us.

We would counsel him that we believe in neither immediate withdrawal nor in escalation, but in exploration of other courses which would defend our interests and those of any legitimate and popular Government of South Vietnam.

We urge restraint while developing a long-range, strategic position which would recognize not only the contingencies of the battlefield, but also the great goals of our Nation in guaranteeing freedom and self-determination for those peoples who want them and will nurture them.

Of what avail to commit additional hundreds of thousands of our best young men in a land war against Asians?

Of what avail winning a war—even without atomic devices—if we were to lose the peace and the support of our allies all around the globe?

The solution to Vietnam is elusive. If we lack anything at this moment, it is a positive solution or an alternative.

But it seems to me—and to many of the rest of us—that there are certain things we should not do. Among them are:

Long and extended ground action in Asia.

Nuclear warfare.

Abandonment of dedication to peace and freedom.

It is my hope that, in setting aside what we do not want and in focusing some attention on the need for long-range goals, perhaps we can together find what we do want without categorizing each other as patriots or traitors or hawks or doves.

There is no question of what I intend to do on the measure now before us. I intend to vote for it. I intend to support our troops there. I have so stated repeatedly. There was concern among some of us that there was an intention by those who sponsor this measure to consider the vote on this measure as a policy determination, a determination that would bind this Congress and bar it from discussing, debating, or questioning what is going on.

I believe that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] voluntarily put at rest most of the fears of many of us when, in his opening statement, he said that the vote on this measure is meant for neither an endorsement of past policies nor a commitment to any future policy.

The Senator from Georgia went further and stated that the vote on this measure would not be considered as being the views of Senators with regard to the foreign policy of the United States.

Other remarks have been made. Some remarks concern how long this debate will continue.

I shall make some further observations than the short ones which I have made today. I plan to do so on Monday. Other Senators plan to do likewise. However, this is not a filibuster.

This measure was laid down before the Senate only a few days ago. Certainly if the administration were inter-